THE

FOUR GOSPELS,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.

WITH

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,

AND

Notes Critical and Explanatory.

By *GEORGE CAMPBELL*, D.D. F.R.S. Edinburgh;
PRINCIPAL OF MARISCHAL COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

ΜΟΝΗ ΘΥΤΕΟΝ ΤΗ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED BY THOMAS DOBSON, AT THE STONE HOUSE, N° 41, SOUTH SECOND STREET.
1796.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN DOUGLAS, D. D.

Lord Biſhop of Carliſle.

MY LORD,

THE trouble you were laſt year ſo good as to take, in peruſing a conſiderable part of this work in manuſcript, and the favourable ſentiments you were pleaſed to expreſs of what you had got time to peruſe, have emboldened me to dedicate it to your Lordſhip. I mean not thus to beſpeak your future patronage, or even approbation of the whole, when you ſhall become acquainted with it. That can be only as your better judgment ſhall direct. I well know that, if the book have no merit of its own, no patron whatever can long preſerve it, or ought to preſerve it, if he could, from its natural fate, *oblivion*. But I am happy in this opportunity of expreſſing to the world my gratitude for the patronage you have already beſtowed both on it and on its author. I am happy alſo to have it in my power to inſcribe a work intended for promoting the beſt intereſts

tereſts of mankind, the cauſe of truth and probity, to one who, to the ſatisfaction of the candid and judicious, has approved himſelf an able defender of the moſt important truths, as well as a ſucceſsful detecter of fraud and falſehood.

I have the honour to be, with great reſpect,

MY LORD,

Your Lordſhip's moſt obliged
and moſt obedient ſervant,
GEORGE CAMPBELL.

ABERDEEN,
September 17, 1788.

CONTENTS.

Page

PREFACE. i

DISSERTATION I.

Obſervations on the Language and Idiom of the New Teſtament, on the Diverſity of Style, and on the Inſpiration of the ſacred Writers.

PART I. The Language and Idiom. - - - 1
PART II. The Style and Inſpiration. - - - 9

DISSERTATION II.

The Cauſes to which the principal Differences in Languages are imputable; the Origin of the Changes produced on the Language and the Idiom of the Jews; the principal Difficulties to be encountered in tranſlating the ſacred Books.

PART I. The Cauſes of the Differences in Languages. - - 13
PART II. The Origin of the Changes in the Idiom of the Jews. - 17
PART III. The Difficulties found in tranſlating the Scriptures. - 20

DISSERTATION III.

Of the Style of the Scripture Hiſtory, particularly the Goſpels.—Its Perſpicuity defended againſt the Objections of Father Simon. - - 24

DIS-

DISSERTATION IV.

Obſervations on the right Method of proceeding in the critical Examination of the Books of the New Teſtament. - - - 38

DISSERTATION V.

Of the proper Verſion of ſome Names of principal Import in the New Teſtament. - - - - - 51

PART I. Of the Phraſe ἡ Βασιλεια τυ θευ, or των ὑρανων. - - ibid.
PART II. Of the Name το ευαγγελιον. - - - 53
PART III. Of the Phraſe ἡ καινη διαθηκη. - - 61
PART IV. Of the Name ὁ Χριστος. - - - 62

DISSERTATION VI.

Inquiry into the Differences in the Import of ſome Words commonly thought ſynonymous. - - - - - 68

PART I. Διαβολος, Δαιμων and Δαιμονιον. - - - ib.
PART II. Ἁδης and γεεννα. - - - - 76
PART III. Μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι. - - - 89
PART IV. Ἁγιος and ὁσιος. - - - - 94
PART V. Κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, and διδασκειν. - - 102

DISSERTATION VII.

Inquiry into the Import of certain Titles of Honour occurring in the New Teſtament. - - - - 110

PART I. Κυριος. - - - - ib.
PART II. Διδασκαλος, Rabbi. - - - 119

DISSERTATION VIII.

Obſervations on the Manner of rendering ſome Words to which there are not any that perfectly correſpond in modern Languages. - - 125

PART I. Weights, Meaſures, and Coins. - - ib.
PART II. Rites, Feſtivals, and Sects. - - - 131
PART III. Dreſs, Judicatories, and Offices. - - 132

DIS-

DISSERTATION IX.

Inquiry whether certain Names which have been adopted into moſt Tranſlations of Scripture in the Weſt, coincide in Meaning with the original Terms from which they are derived, and of which they are uſed as the Verſion. - 141

PART I. Of Myſtery. - - - - ibid.
PART II. Of Blaſphemy. - - - - 146
PART III. Of Schiſm. - - - - 153
PART IV. Of Hereſy. - - - - 156

DISSERTATION X.

The chief Things to be attended to in tranſlating.—A comparative View of the oppoſite Methods taken by Tranſlators of Holy Writ.

PART I. The Things to be attended to in tranſlating. - - - 164
PART II. Strictures on Arias Montanus. - - - 165
PART III. Strictures on the Vulgate. - - - 169
PART IV. Strictures on Caſtalio. - - - - 174
PART V. Strictures on Beza. - - - - 181

DISSERTATION XI.

Of the Regard which, in tranſlating Scripture into Engliſh, is due to the Practice of former Tranſlators, particularly of the Authors of the Latin Vulgate, and of the common Engliſh Tranſlation.

PART I. The Regard due to the Vulgate. - - - 192
PART II. The Regard due to the Engliſh Tranſlation. - - 209

DISSERTATION XII.

An Account of what is attempted in the Tranſlation of the Goſpels, and in the Notes here offered to the Public. - - - 217

PART I. The eſſential Qualities of the Verſion. - - ib.
PART II. The Readings of the Original here followed. - - 235
PART III. The Dialect employed. - - - - 243
PART IV. The outward Form of the Verſion. - - - 249
PART V. The Notes. - - - - - 255

Preface to Matthew's Goſpel. - - - - 261
The Goſpel by Matthew. - - - - - 285
Preface to Mark's Goſpel. - - - - 335
The Goſpel by Mark. - - - - - - 343
Preface to Luke's Goſpel. - - - - 375
The Goſpel by Luke. - - - - - 389
Preface to John's Goſpel. - - - - 441
The Goſpel by John. - - - - - - 451

NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

The Goſpel by Matthew - - - - 3
——————— by Mark - - - - 71
——————— by Luke - - - - 97
——————— by John. - - - - - 149

Index of Texts in the other Books of Scripture, and the Apocryphal Writings, occaſionally illuſtrated. - - - 197
Index of Greek Words and Phraſes occaſionally illuſtrated. - - 205

PREFACE.

IN compliance with a cuſtom, which is not without its advantages, I purpoſe, in this place, to lay before the reader ſome account of the following work, its riſe and progreſs, nature and deſign. To do ſo will, perhaps, be thought the more neceſſary, as there have been, in this and the preceding century, many publications on the Goſpels, both abroad and at home, in ſome or other of which, it may be ſuppoſed, that all the obſervations of any conſequence, which can be offered here, muſt have been anticipated, and the ſubject in a manner exhauſted. I am not of opinion that the ſubject can be ſo eaſily exhauſted as ſome may ſuppoſe. I do not even think it poſſible for the richeſt imagination to preclude all ſcope for further remark, or for the greateſt acuteneſs to ſuperſede all future criticiſm. On the other hand, it muſt be owned poſſible, that a man may write copiouſly on a ſubject, without adding to the ſtock of knowledge provided by thoſe who wrote before him, or ſaying any thing which has not been already as well, or perhaps better, ſaid by others. How far this is applicable to the preſent publication, muſt be ſubmitted to the judicious and intelligent reader. In the mean time, it may be hoped that it will not be judged an unfair attempt at beſpeaking his favour, to give him a brief account of the origin and preparation of the work now offered to his examination.

As far back as the year 1750, ſoon after I had gotten the charge of a country pariſh, I firſt formed the deſign of collecting ſuch uſeful criticiſms on the text of the New Teſtament, as ſhould either occur to my own obſervation, or as I ſhould meet with in the courſe of my reading; particularly, to take notice of ſuch propoſed alterations on the manner of tranſlating the words of the original, as appeared not only defenſible in themſelves, but to yield a better meaning, or at leaſt, to expreſs the meaning with more perſpicuity or energy. Having, for this purpoſe, provided a folio paper book, which I divided into pages and columns, correſponding to the pages and columns of the Greek New Teſtament which I commonly uſed, I wrote down there, in the proper place, as they occurred, ſuch alterations on the tranſlation as, in my judgment, tended to improve it, and could be rationally ſupported. And having divided the pages in the middle, I allotted the upper part of each for the verſion, and the lower for *ſcholia*, or notes containing the reaſons (wherever it appeared neceſſary to ſpecify reaſons) of the changes introduced. In this way I proceeded many years, merely for my own improvement, and that I might qualify myſelf for being more uſeful to the people intruſted to my care. I did not aſſign to this occupation any ſtated portion of my time, but recurred to it occaſionally, when any thing occurred in reading, or offered itſelf to my reflections, which appeared to throw light on any paſſage of the New Teſtament.

Things proceeded in this train, till I found I had made a new verſion of a conſiderable part of that book, particularly of the Goſpels. The *ſcholia* I had added, were indeed very brief, being intended only to remind me of the principal reaſons on which my judgment of the different paſſages had been founded. But ſoon after, from a change of circumſtances and ſituation, having occaſion to turn my thoughts more cloſely to ſcriptural criticiſm than formerly, I entered into a minute examination of many points concerning which I had thrown together ſome hints in my collection. On ſome of the points examined, I have found reaſon to change my firſt opinion: on others I have been confirmed in the judgment I had adopted. I have always laid it down as a rule, in my reſearches, to diveſt myſelf, as much as poſſible, of an exceſſive deference to the judgment of men; and I think that, in my attempts this way, I have not been unſucceſsful. I am even

 confident

of the divine teſtimony, is the more inexcuſable, as the circumſtance on which the rejection is founded, is ſuch as the whole analogy of nature leads us to expect, in all the works of the Creator. If, in every part of the creation, we find that there are many creatures, the purpoſe of whoſe exiſtence we cannot inveſtigate; and that there are hardly any natural productions in which, though, from experience, we may diſcover the cauſe, we can trace its operation; it is but juſt to conclude, that this unſearchableneſs to human faculties, is a ſort of ſignature impreſſed on the works of the Moſt High, and which, when found in any thing atteſted as from him, ought to be held, at leaſt, a preſumption in favour of the teſtimony.

But, though nothing can be more different from an implicit adoption of all the definitions, diſtinctions, and particularities of a ſect, than the general diſpoſition of the rationaliſts; there is often a great reſemblance in their methods of criticiſing, and in the ſtretches which they make for diſguiſing the natural interpretation of the ſacred text. Each is, in this, actuated by the ſame motive, namely, to obtrude on others that interpretation which ſuits his favourite hypotheſis. And, if we may ſay of the one, that he is too fooliſh to be improved by teaching; we may, with equal juſtice, ſay of the other, that he is too wiſe to attend to it. Revelation, ſurely, was never intended for ſuch as he. Our Lord ſaid to the Phariſees, that he came not *to call the righteous, but ſinners, to repentance**. We may, with like reaſon, ſay, he came not to inſtruct the *learned*, but the *ignorant*. Nay, he, in effect, ſays ſo himſelf. It was to *babes* in knowledge, not to *ſages*, that the things of God were revealed by him †. The diſpoſition of children, ſo often recommended as neceſſary for our giving a proper reception to the Goſpel, and obtaining admiſſion into the kingdom, refers as clearly to the teachable temper of children, free from prepoſſeſſions and ſelf-conceit, as to their humility and innocence. How ſtrongly it this ſentiment expreſſed by the Apoſtle: *If any man among you ſeemeth to be wiſe in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wiſe* ‡! The judicious and candid will not miſtake me, as, in matters of religion, decrying the uſe of reaſon, without which, I am ſenſible, we cannot proceed a ſingle ſtep; but as pointing out the proper application of this faculty.

In what concerns revelation, reaſon has a two-fold province; firſt, to judge whether what is preſented to us as a revelation from God, or, which is the ſame thing, as the divine teſtimony to the truth of the things therein contained, be really ſuch or not; ſecondly, to judge what is the import of the teſtimony given. For the former of theſe, firſt, the external evidences of Chriſtianity offer themſelves to our examination, prophecy, miracles, human teſtimony; and then the internal, ariſing from the character of the diſpenſation itſelf, its ſuitableneſs to the rational and moral nature of ſuch a creature as man. As to the ſecond point, the meaning of the revelation given; if God has condeſcended to employ any human language in revealing his will to men, he has, by employing ſuch an inſtrument, given us reaſon to conclude that, by the eſtabliſhed rules of interpretation in that language, his meaning muſt be interpreted. Otherwiſe the uſe of the language could anſwer no end, but either to confound, or to deceive. If the words of God were to be interpreted by another ſet of rules than that with which the grammar of the language, founded in general uſe, preſents us; with no propriety could it be ſaid that the divine will is revealed to us, till there were a new revelation furniſhing us with a key for unlocking the old. This conſideration points to the neceſſity of the grammatical art, and of criticiſm, by means of which, readers, eſpecially of a diſtant age and country, muſt arrive at the requiſite proficiency in the language. As to both theſe, it is evident that the ſacred writers addreſs themſelves to our reaſon. *Why*, ſaid our Lord §, *even of yourſelves, judge ye not what is right?* And the Apoſtle Paul ‖: *I ſpeak as to wiſe men, judge ye what I ſay.* With the firſt, the evidences of the truth of our religion, I am not here concerned. The great deſign of this work is, to deliver with plainneſs, in our own tongue, a very eſſential part of what was, more than ſeventeen centuries ago, communicated in another tongue, to the inhabitants of countries remote from ours. It was, in order the more effectually to anſwer this end, particularly, to remove all prejudices and prepoſſeſſions which might prove obſtructions in the way, that I determined, on reflection, to add to the Verſion the Preliminary Diſſertations, and the Notes.

The neceſſary aids for acquiring the knowledge of an ancient and foreign tongue, are more or fewer, according to the circumſtances of the caſe. The diſtance of time and place, and the great difference, in reſpect of cuſtoms, manners, and ſentiments, between thoſe to whom the ſacred writers firſt addreſſed themſelves, and the preſent inhabitants of this iſland, could not fail to occaſion our meeting with ſome difficulties. And, although it cannot be juſtly doubted, that a good deal of light has been thrown on ſome points, by the labours of former critics; it can as little be denied that, by the ſame means, many things have been involved in greater darkneſs. In other critical enquiries, wherein religion is not concerned, there is little to biaſs the judgment in pronouncing on what ſide the truth lies. But where religion is concerned, there are often not only inveterate prejudices, but ſecular motives, to be ſurmounted, to whoſe influence few can boaſt an entire ſuperiority. Beſides, I ſhall have an opportunity to obſerve, in the ſequel, that, in what relates

* Mat. ix. 13. † Mat. xi. 25. ‡ 1 Cor. iii. 18. § Lu. xii. 57. ‖ 1 Cor. 15. x.

relates to this ſubject, there has come a gradual change on the meaning of many words, conſequent on the changes which have been gradually introduced into the church, in religious ceremonies, modes of government, and formularies of doctrine. Old names are given to things comparatively new, which have, by inſenſible degrees, ariſen out of the old, and have at laſt ſupplanted them.

To trace ſuch changes with accuracy, is an eſſential quality of philology. A tranſlator, when he finds that the words uſed by former tranſlators, though right at firſt, have ſince contracted a meaning different from that in which they were originally employed, ſees it neceſſary, that he may do juſtice both to his author and to his ſubject, to ſubſtitute ſuch terms as, to the beſt of his judgment, are adapted to convey thoſe ſentiments, and thoſe only, intended by the author. When a change is made from what people have been long accuſtomed to, it is juſtly expected that the reaſon, unleſs it be obvious, ſhould be aſſigned. Hence ariſes the propriety of *ſcholia*, or notes, both for vindicating the verſion, and for ſupplying further information, which, if not neceſſary to all, is, to moſt readers, highly uſeful. The frequent alluſions to rites, cuſtoms, and incidents, well known to the natives of the writer's country, and to his contemporaries, render ſuch occaſional illuſtrations, as can be given in the notes, very expedient for thoſe of diſtant lands and ages. It is not on account of any peculiar obſcurity in ſacred writ, that more has been judged requiſite in this way, with regard to it, than with regard to any other writings; but partly on account of certain peculiarities in the caſe, and partly on account of the ſuperior importance of the ſubject. Of both theſe I ſhall have occaſion to take notice in the Preliminary Diſſertations. There is a further uſe in bringing additional light for viewing theſe ſubjects in, though we admit that the light abſolutely neceſſary was not deficient before. To brighten our perceptions is to ſtrengthen them, and to ſtrengthen them is to give them a firmer hold of the memory, and to render them more productive of all the good fruits that might naturally be expected from them. The moſt we can ſay of the beſt illuſtrations which, from the knowledge of Chriſtian antiquity, critics have been enabled to give the ſacred text, is like that which the ingenious author of Polymetis ſays, in regard to the utility of his inquiries into the remains of ancient ſculpture and painting, for throwing light upon the claſſics. "The chief uſe," ſays he,* "I have found in this ſort "of ſtudy, has not been ſo much in diſcovering what "was wholly unknown, as in ſtrengthening and beau-"tifying what was known before. When the day "was ſo much overcaſt juſt now, you ſaw all the "ſame objects that you do at preſent; theſe trees, that "river, the foreſt on the left hand, and thoſe ſpreading "vales to the right: but now the ſun is broke out, "you ſee all of them more clearly, and with more "pleaſure. It ſhews ſcarce any thing that you did not "ſee before; but it gives a new life and luſtre to "every thing that you did ſee."

But it cannot be denied that, on this ſubject, many things have been advanced, in the way of illuſtration, which have ſerved more to darken, than to illuminate, the ſacred pages. I have great reaſon to think that, in my reſearches into this matter, I have been impartial; but, whether I have been ſucceſsful, is another queſtion: for, though partiality in the method of conducting an enquiry, ſufficiently accounts for its proving unfruitful, the utmoſt impartiality will not always enſure ſucceſs. There are more conſiderations which, in a work of this kind, muſt be taken into view, than even readers of diſcernment will at firſt have any apprehenſion of. Several of the changes here adopted, in tranſlating both words and idioms, will, I know well, upon a ſuperficial view, be judged erroneous; and many of them will doubtleſs be condemned as frivolous, which it is to be hoped will, on deeper reflection, be admitted, by well-informed judges, both to be more appoſite in themſelves, and to render the matter treated more perſpicuous.

In illuſtrating the principles on which ſome of the changes here made are founded, a great deal more, in the way of critical diſcuſſion, was found neceſſary, in order to do juſtice to the argument, than could, with propriety, be thrown into the notes. A conviction of this, firſt ſuggeſted the deſign of diſcuſſing ſome points more fully in preliminary diſſertations. This, however, is not the only uſe which theſe diſcourſes were intended to anſwer. Though there has appeared, ſince the revival of letters in the Weſt, a numerous liſt of critics on the Bible, little has been done for aſcertaining the proper, and, in ſome reſpect, peculiar, rules of criticiſing the ſacred books; for pointing out the difficulties and the dangers to which the different methods have been expoſed, and the moſt probable means of ſurmounting the one, and eſcaping the other. Something in this way has been attempted here. Beſides I have been the more free in applying my philological remarks, in theſe diſcourſes, to various paſſages in the other apoſtolical writings, as I had a more extenſive view in tranſlating, when I firſt engaged in it, than that to which at laſt I found it neceſſary to confine myſelf.

I have endeavoured, in the interpretations given, to avoid, with equal care, an immoderate attachment to both extremes, *antiquity* and *novelty*. I am not conſcious that I have, in any inſtance, been inclined to diſguiſe the falſity of an opinion, becauſe ancient, or, with partial fondneſs, haſtily to admit its truth, becauſe new. That an opinion is the opinion of the multitude is, to ſome, a powerful recommendation; to others it

* Dialogue VI.

it appears an infallible criterion of error; to thoſe who are truly rational it will be neither. There are, indeed, many caſes wherein antiquity and univerſality are evidences of ſome importance. It has been, all along, my intention never to overlook theſe circumſtances, where they could be urged with propriety; for certain it is, that ſingularity is rather an unfavourable preſumption. But I hope that, with the help of ſome things which are treated in the Preliminary Diſſertations, the intelligent and candid reader will be convinced, that nowhere have I more effectually reſtored the undiſguiſed ſentiments of antiquity, than where I employ expreſſions which, at firſt ſight, may appear to proceed from the affectation of novelty. I have, to the utmoſt of my power, obſerved the injunction which God gave to the prophet Jeremiah: * I have *ſtood in the ways;* I have *looked and aſked for the old paths.* And if, in this reſearch, I have, in any inſtances, proved ſucceſsful, men of diſcernment will, I am perſuaded, be ſenſible, that nowhere have I been luckier in conveying the genuine conceptions of the moſt venerable antiquity, than in thoſe places which, to a ſuperficial examination, will appear, in point of language, moſt chargeable with innovation. The very command, to look and to aſk for the old paths, implies that it may happen that the old paths are deſerted, conſequently untrodden, and known, comparatively, to very few. In that caſe, it is manifeſt that the perſon who would recommend them, runs the riſk of being treated as an innovator. This charge, therefore, of affecting novelty, though very common, muſt be, of all accuſations, the moſt equivocal; ſince, in certain circumſtances, nothing can more expoſe a man to it, than an inflexible adherence to antiquity.

I may, in this work, have erred in many things: for to err is the lot of frail humanity; and no merely human production ever was, or ever will be, faultleſs. But I can ſay, with confidence, that I have not erred in any thing eſſential. And wherefore am I thus confident? Becauſe I am conſcious that I have aſſiduouſly looked and aſked for the old paths; that I have ſought out the good way; that I might, at all hazards, both walk therein myſelf, and recommend it to others: and becauſe I believe the word of the Lord Jeſus: *Whoſoever will do the will of God, ſhall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God*†. This I think a ſufficient ſecurity, that no perſon, who is truly thus minded, ſhall err in what is eſſential. In what concerns the vitals of religion, rectitude of diſpoſition goes farther, even to enlighten the mind, than acuteneſs of intellect, however important this may be, in other reſpects. But the exerciſe of no faculty is to be deſpiſed, that can be rendered, in any degree, conducive to our advancement in the knowledge of God. Nay, it is our duty to exert every faculty in this acquiſition, as much as poſſible.

In an age like the preſent, wherein literary productions are ſo greatly multiplied, it is not matter of wonder that readers, when they hear of any new work, enquire about what, in modern phraſe, is called the *originality* of the thoughts, and the beauties of ſtyle it poſſeſſes. The preſs teems daily with the labours of the learned. Plenty in this, as in every other commodity, makes people harder to be pleaſed: hence it happens, that authors are ſometimes tempted, for the ſake of gratifying the over-nice and faſtidious taſte of their readers, to affect paradoxes, and to ſay things extravagant and incredible, being more ſolicitous about the newneſs, or even the uncommonneſs, than about the truth, of their ſentiments. Though I cannot help thinking this preference injudicious, whatever be the ſubject, it is highly blameable in every thing wherein religion or morals are concerned. To this humour, therefore, no ſacrifice can be expected here. The principal part of the preſent work is tranſlation. A tranſlator, if he do juſtice to his author and his ſubject, can lay no claim to originality. The thoughts are the author's; the tranſlator's buſineſs is to convey them unadulterated, in the words of another language. To blend them with his own ſentiments, or with any ſentiments which are not the author's, is to diſcharge the humble office of tranſlator unfaithfully. In the Tranſlation here offered, I have endeavoured to conform ſtrictly to this obligation. As to the remarks to be found in the Diſſertations and Notes, nothing was farther from my purpoſe than, in any inſtance, to ſacrifice truth to novelty. At the ſame time I will, on the other hand, frankly acknowledge that, if I had not thought myſelf qualified to throw ſome light on this moſt important part of holy writ, no conſideration ſhould have induced me to obtrude my reflections on the public. If I have deceived myſelf on this article, it is, at the worſt, a misfortune which appears to be very incident to authors. But if ſome readers, for different readers will think differently, ſhould find me, on ſome articles, more chargeable with the extreme of novelty, than with that of triteneſs of ſentiment; I hope that the novelty, when narrowly examined, will be diſcovered, as was hinted above, to reſult from tracing out paths which had been long forſaken, and clearing the ancient ways of part of the rubbiſh in which, in the tract of ages, they had unhappily been involved. Thoſe who are profoundly read in theological controverſy, before they enter on the critical examination of the divine oracles, if they have the diſcernment to diſcover the right path, which their former ſtudies have done much to prevent, and if they have the fortitude to perſevere in keeping that path, will quickly be ſenſible, that they have more to unlearn, than to learn; and that the acquiſition of truth is not near ſo difficult a taſk, as to attain a ſuperiority over rooted errors and old prejudices.

As to the expoſition of the text, where there is thought

* Jer. vi. 16. † Jo. vii. 17.

thought to be any difficulty, it is ſeldom that any thing new can be reaſonably expected. If, out of the many diſcordant opinions of former expoſitors, I ſhall be thought, by the judicious, to have generally choſen the beſt (that is, the moſt probable), I have attained, in regard to myſelf, my utmoſt wiſh. On this article, the exerciſe of judgment is requiſite, much more than of ingenuity. The latter but too often miſleads. In adopting the interpretation of any former tranſlator or expoſitor, I commonly name the author, if at the time he occur to my memory; but not when the expoſition has been ſo long, and is ſo generally, adopted, that it would be difficult to ſay from whom it originated. Let it be obſerved, alſo, that, when no perſon is named, I do not claim to be conſidered as the diſcoverer myſelf. A perſon will remember to have heard or read a particular obſervation or criticiſm, though he does not recollect from whom, or in what book; nay, more, to reading and converſation we doubtleſs owe many ſentiments, which are faithfully retained, when the manner wherein they were acquired is totally forgotten.

For my own part, I do not pretend to much reading in this way. I have not been accuſtomed to read whole commentaries. My way is (what I recommend to others, eſpecially ſtudents), to conſult them only occaſionally, when, in reading I meet with any difficulty; and not even then, till after other helps, particularly the various readings, the ancient verſions, the context, and the uſe of the ſacred writers in other paſſages, have been, with the aid of concordances, in vain recurred to. Some ſeem to make the whole ſtudy of Scripture merely an exerciſe of memory; in my opinion, it conſiſts much more in the exerciſe of judgment and reflection. It is only thus that we can hope to attain that acuteneſs, and preſerve that impartiality, in judging, which will ſecure us againſt calling any *man father upon earth*. In this way, we ſhall avail ourſelves of the ſervices of the beſt expoſitors, on different, and even oppoſite, ſides, without ſubjecting ourſelves to any. We may expect to meet, in all of them, with faults and imperfections; but, if I can ſafely reaſon from experience, I do not heſitate to ſay, that the leaſt dogmatical, the moſt diffident of their own judgment, and moderate in their opinions of others, will be ever found the moſt judicious. Thoſe, on the contrary, who are either the idolaters of their own reaſon, or blindly devoted to that of ſome favourite doctor, to whom they have implicitly reſigned their underſtandings, diſplay as often the talent of darkening a clear paſſage, as of enlightening a dark one. However, I am far from thinking that even ſuch may not be ſometimes conſulted with advantage. Conſiderable abilities are often united in the ſame perſon with conſiderable defects. And whatever a man's prepoſſeſſions, in point of opinion may be, there are ſome things in Scripture which cannot be ſaid to have any relation to them. In regard to all ſuch, it may juſtly be expected, that learning and talents will produce ſome light. There are few, therefore, who have really the advantages of literature and abilities, who, whatever be the party or ſyſtem to which they have attached themſelves, may not occaſionally prove uſeful aids.

For the readings here adopted, I have been chiefly indebted to the valuable folio edition of the Greek New Teſtament publiſhed by Mill, and that publiſhed by Wetſtein, but without blindly following the opinion of either. In the judgments formed by theſe editors, with reſpect to the true reading, they appear to be in extremes: the former often acquieſces in too little evidence, the latter requires too much. This, at leaſt, holds in general. But whether I agree with, or differ from, either, or both of theſe, about any particular reading by which the ſenſe is affected; that every intelligent reader may judge for himſelf, I commonly aſſign my reaſon in the notes. I do not, therefore, mean to enter further into the ſubject, or to examine the critical cannons on which they found, or the opinions they have given on the comparative excellence of different manuſcripts and verſions. What has been written on this ſubject by Simon, Bengelius, Michaelis, and others, render any diſcuſſion here the leſs neceſſary.

For the ancient verſions, where it appeared proper, I have had recourſe to Walton's Polyglot: of ſome, as the Syriac, the Gothic, or, as it is now with greater probability accounted, the Frankiſh, the Anglo-Saxon, the modern Greek, and the Vulgate, I have copies, as well as of all the modern tranſlations quoted in this work. All the late Engliſh tranſlations, of any account, I had provided. There is indeed one, or perhaps two, that I have not met with, about which, to ſay the truth, from the accounts I have had of their plan and method, and from ſome ſpecimens, I have not felt much ſolicitude. I am, however, far from ſaying that theſe may not alſo have their uſe, and be, in expreſſing ſome things, luckier than verſions which are, on the whole, ſuperior.

As to the language, particularly of the verſion itſelf, ſimplicity, propriety, and perſpicuity, are the principal qualities at which I have aimed. I have endeavoured to keep equally clear of the frippery of Arias, and the finery of Caſtalio. If I have hazarded, on any occaſion, incurring the cenſure of the generality of readers, on account of the diction, I am certain it is in thoſe places where, from a deſire of conveying neither more nor leſs than the exact thought of the author, I have ventured to change ſome expreſſions to which our ears have been long accuſtomed. But on this point I mean to ſay nothing further in this place. The reaſons on which I have proceeded, in ſuch alterations, are fully explained in the preliminary diſcourſes, which I conſider as ſo neceſſary to

the vindication of many things in the tranſlation, that I do not wiſh the judicious reader, if in any degree acquainted with the original, to read the Verſion, till he has given theſe Diſſertations a very attentive and ſerious peruſal.

As I have never yet ſeen a tranſlation of the Bible, or of any part of it, into any language I am acquainted with, which I did not think might be, in ſeveral places, altered for the better; I am not vain enough to imagine, that the Verſion here preſented to the public will, by any claſs of readers, be accounted faultleſs. Part of this work has long lain by me in manuſcript; for I may juſtly ſay of it what Auguſtin, if I remember right, ſays of one of his treatiſes, *Juvenis inchoavi, ſenex edidi.* Now, in that part I have been making corrections, or at leaſt alterations, every year; and I have no reaſon to doubt that, if it were to lie longer by me, I ſhould ſtill be altering and correcting. As I am not an implicit follower of any man, becauſe I think no man can plead an exemption from either faults in practice, or errors in opinion; I am, at the ſame time, far from arrogating to myſelf a merit which I refuſe to acknowledge in others. It is not difficult to make me diſtruſt my own judgment, and impartially re-examine my own reaſoning. I ſay *impartially*, becauſe I am conſcious that I have often, in this manner, reviſed what I had advanced, when I found that it was objected to by a perſon of diſcernment; and, in conſequence of the reviſal, I have been convinced of my miſtake. I will venture to promiſe, therefore, that I ſhall give all due attention to any criticiſms or remarks, candid or uncandid, which ſhall be made on any part of this work. Criticiſms made in an uncandid manner may, as to the matter of them, be well founded, and, on that account, deſerve attention. But if there appear neither reaſon in the matter of the criticiſm, nor candour in the manner of producing it, the moſt prudent part in an author is to let it paſs without notice.

If the language of the tranſlation, in the ſecond volume, ſhall be thought not unſuitable, and ſufficiently perſpicuous, I have, in what concerns the expreſſion, attained my principal object. The reſt, I imagine, will be intelligible enough to thoſe who are converſant in queſtions of Chriſtian antiquities and criticiſm. Senſible of the diſadvantages, in point of ſtyle, which my northern ſituation lays me under, I have availed myſelf of every opportunity of better information, in regard to all thoſe terms and phraſes, in the Verſion, of which I was doubtful. I feel myſelf under particular obligations, on this account, to one gentleman, my valuable friend and colleague, Dr. Beattie, who, though ſimilarly ſituated with myſelf, has, with greater ſucceſs, ſtudied the genius and idiom of our language; and of whom it is no more than juſtice to add, that the acknowledged purity of his own diction, is the leaſt of his many qualifications as an author. But if, notwithſtanding all the care I have taken, I ſhall be found, in many places, to need the indulgence of the Engliſh reader, it will not much ſurpriſe me. One who often reviſes and alters, will ſometimes alter for the worſe: and, in changing, one has not always at hand a friend to conſult with. The apology which Ireneus, biſhop of Lyons in Gaul, in the ſecond century, makes for his language, in a book he publiſhed in defence of religion, appears to me ſo candid, ſo modeſt, ſo ſenſible, and at the ſame time ſo appoſite to my own caſe, that I cannot avoid tranſcribing and adopting it: "Non autem exquires a "nobis qui apud Celtas commoramur, et in barbarum "ſermonem plerumque avocamur, orationis artem "quam non didicimus, neque vim conſcriptoris quam "non affectavimus, neque ornamentum verborum, "neque ſuadelam quam neſcimus: ſed ſimpliciter et verè "et idioticè, ea quæ tibi cum dilectione ſcripta ſunt, "cum dilectione percipies; et ipſe augeas ea penes te, "ut magis idoneus quam nos, quaſi ſemen et initia ac"cipiens a nobis; et in latitudine ſenſus tui, in multum "fructificabis ea, quæ in paucis a nobis dicta ſunt; "et potenter aſſeres iis qui tecum ſunt, ea quæ invalidè "a nobis relata ſunt *."

Need I, in ſo late and ſo enlightened an age, ſubjoin an apology for the deſign itſelf, of giving a new tranſlation of any part of Scripture? Yet there are ſome knowing and ingenious men, who ſeem to be alarmed at the mention of tranſlation, as if ſuch an attempt would ſap the very foundations of the Chriſtian edifice, and put the faith of the people in the moſt imminent danger of being buried in its ruins. This is no new apprehenſion. The ſame alarm was taken ſo early as the fourth century, when Jerom was employed in preparing a new tranſlation of the Bible into Latin; or, at leaſt, in making ſuch alterations and corrections on the old Italic, as the original and the beſt Latin manuſcripts ſhould appear to warrant. The people in general exclaimed; and even the learned were far from applauding an attempt which, in their judgment, was ſo bold and ſo dangerous. I do not allude to the abuſe thrown out by Ruffinus, becauſe he was then at variance with Jerom on another account; but even men, who were conſidered as the lights of age, were not without their fears. Auguſtin, in particular, who admired the profound erudition of Jerom, and had a high eſteem of his talents, yet dreaded much, that the conſequence of ſuch an undertaking would prove prejudicial to the authority of Scripture; and did not heſitate to expreſs his diſapprobation in very ſtrong terms. That interpreter, however, perſevered, in ſpite of the greateſt diſcouragements, the diſſuaſion of friends, the invectives of enemies, and the unfavourable impreſſions which, by their means, were made upon the people. The verſion was made and publiſhed: and thoſe hideous bugbears of fatal conſequences,

* Adverſus Hæreſes, lib. i. Preſatio.

quences, which had been ſo much deſcanted on, were no more heard of.

Luckily, no attempt was made to eſtabliſh the new verſion, by public authority. Though Damaſus, then biſhop of Rome, was known to favour it, the attempt to obtrude it upon the people, would probably have awaked ſuch a perſecution againſt it, as would have ſtifled it in the birth. On the contrary, its ſucceſs was left entirely, as it ought to be, to the efficiency of its own merit. In conſequence of this, the prejudice very ſoon ſubſided: many of thoſe who were at firſt declared enemies of the undertaking, were entirely reconciled to it. Auguſtin, himſelf, came to be convinced that it was guiltleſs of thoſe horrors which his warm imagination had foreboded. Nay, he did not ſcruple to recur to it for aid, in explaining the Scriptures. The verſion, thus quietly introduced about the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth, century, and left to its fate, to be uſed by thoſe who liked it, and neglected by thoſe who diſliked it, advanced in reputation every day. The people very ſoon, and very generally, diſcovered that, along with all the ſimplicity they could deſire, it was in every reſpect, more intelligible, and, conſequently, both more inſtructive, and more agreeable, than the old. The immediate effect of this general conviction, was greatly to multiply the copies, which proved, in a very few centuries, the total extinction of the Italic, formerly called the Vulgate, verſion, and the eſtabliſhment of the preſent Vulgate, or Jerom's tranſlation, in its room. To make this ſuddden revolution, which is a matter of ſo much importance, better underſtood by the unlearned, it is proper to obſerve, that it was in conſequence of no law of the church, or indeed of any Chriſtian country, that the old Italic firſt, and the preſent Vulgate afterwards, were uſed in churches in the offices of religion. Such matters were regulated in every individual church, by the biſhop and preſbyters of that church, as appeared moſt for the edification of the people. Now the general and growing reputation of the new verſion, made it ſoon ſupplant the old. As it was not to any law of church or ſtate, that the Italic owed its promotion at firſt; ſo it required no law of either, to make it give place, quietly, to a better verſion. After this of Jerom had come gradually to obtain every where the preference, and to be uſed in private families, by individuals, it might be expected that ſo general an approbation would gradually uſher it into the churches. For an authoritative ſentence, of either pope or council, in favour of any tranſlation, was a thing unheard of till the ſixteenth century, when the decree of the council of Trent was obtained in favour of the preſent Vulgate. Now, the Vulgate, we may obſerve, by the way, had been, for ages before, by the tacit conſent of all ranks in full poſſeſſion of all the prerogatives conferred by that council.

But, though the introduction of a new tranſlation produced none of thoſe terrible conſequences which had been preſaged; though, on the contrary, by rendering the ſtyle of Scripture purer, as well as more perſpicuous, it came ſoon to be read by the people with greater pleaſure and improvement; yet it muſt be owned, that the clamour and jealouſies that had been raiſed on this ſubject, were productive of one very unfavourable effect upon the interpreter. Though it did not make him deſiſt from his undertaking, it made him proſecute it with a timidity which has proved hurtful to the work itſelf. Many things which, by the old interpreter, had been improperly rendered; many things which had been obſcurely, or even unintelligibly, expreſſed, Jerom, through dread of the ſcandal which too many changes might occaſion, has left as he found them. We have, therefore, the utmoſt reaſon to conclude, that to this cauſe alone it is imputable, that the preſent Vulgate is not greatly ſuperior to what we find it. Jerom was ſtrongly impreſſed with a ſenſe of the danger to which his attempt expoſed him. This appears from many parts of his writings; particularly from his letter to pope Damaſus, prefixed to the tranſlation of the Goſpels: "Pe-
"riculoſa preſumptio," ſays he, "judicare de cæteris,
"ipſum ab omnibus judicandum: ſenis mutare linguam,
"et caneſcentem mundum ad initia retrahere parvulo-
"rum. Quis, enim, doctus pariter vel indoctus; cum
"in manus volumen aſſumpſerit; et a ſaliva quam ſemel
"imbibit, viderit diſcrepare, quod lectitat; non ſtatim
"erumpat in vocem, me falſarium, me clamans eſſe ſa-
"crilegium, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris, ad-
"dere, mutare, corrigere."

How diſmal were the apprehenſions which were entertained immediately after the Reformation, on account of the many tranſlations of Scripture which came in quick ſucceſſion, one after another? Have men's fears been juſtified by the effect? Quite the reverſe. The violent concuſſion of parties at the Reformation produced, as might have been expected, a number of controverſies, which were, for ſome time, hotly agitated; but the greater part of theſe were in being before thoſe verſions were made. And if a few have ariſen ſince, many have ſubſided, which once made a great noiſe, and produced a great ferment, in the church. Nothing will be found to have conduced more to ſubvert the dominion of the metaphyſical theology of the ſchoolmen, with all its interminable queſtions, cobweb diſtinctions, and wars of words, than the critical ſtudy of the ſacred Scriptures, to which the modern tranſlations have not a little contributed. Nothing has gone farther to ſatisfy reaſonable men, that, in many of the profound diſputes of theologians, revelation could not, with juſtice, be accuſed of giving countenance to either ſide. Yet no diſputes have been productive of more rancour in the diſputants, or been carried on with greater virulence, than thoſe which are merely verbal.

It has been ſaid, that the introduction of different tranſlations tends to unſettle men in their principles, particularly with regard to the authority of ſacred writ, which, ſay they, is made to ſpeak ſo variouſly in theſe productions. For my part, I have not diſcovered that this is, in any degree, the effect. The agreement of all the tranſlations, as to the meaning, in every thing of principal conſequence, makes their differences, when properly conſidered, appear as nothing. They are are but like the inconſiderable variations in expreſſion which different witneſſes, though all perfectly unexceptionable, employ in relating the ſame fact. They rather confirm men's faith in Scripture, as they ſhow, in the ſtrongeſt light, that all the various ways which men of diſcordant ſentiments have deviſed, of rendering its words, have made no material alteration, either on the narrative itſelf, or on the divine inſtructions contained in it. People are at no loſs to diſcover, that the difference among interpreters lies chiefly in this, that one renders the account of things, which that book exhibits, more intelligible, more perſpicuous, or even more affecting, than another. Theſe differences are, I acknowledge, of great moment to readers; they are ſuch as may ſhow one verſion to be greatly ſuperior to another in point of uſe; yet as they are all compatible with juſtneſs of repreſentation in every thing eſſential to the hiſtorical and didactic parts of the work, they are ſo far from affecting the credibility of the whole, that they ſerve not a little to confirm it. A gentleman, who knows neither Greek nor Hebrew, but underſtands Latin, and ſeveral modern tongues, told me once, he had read the New Teſtament in different languages, and that he had reaped conſiderable benefit from the practice, in more ways than one; particularly in this, that thoſe verſions ſerved as vouchers for the fidelity of one another, by their concurrence in every thing eſſential in that book: for when it was conſidered that the tranſlators were not only men of different nations, but of hoſtile ſects, Roman Catholics, church of Englandmen, Lutherans, Calviniſts, Remonſtrants, &c. their perfect harmony on all material points, is the beſt pledge we could deſire of their veracity.

Of nearly the ſame kind and conſequence have been the fears which even judicious men have entertained about the publication of the various readings of the Scriptures. Theſe readings are tremendous only, when conſidered in a general view, and when we are told of the number they amount to. Nothing ſerves more to undeceive us, than to conſider them in detail, and fairly examine thoſe collections. I will acknowledge, for one, that I believe I ſhould not have been eaſily perſuaded, till I made the experiment, that the authority of Scripture could be ſo little injured by them. The actual collection is, therefore, of great conſequence, for ſatisfying candid and reaſonable men, that there is nothing in them ſo formidable, as the vague and general repreſentations of their number and weight would lead men to conclude. Now, if ſuch a man as Dr. Whitby, a man of diſtinguiſhed learning and abilities, was alarmed at Mill's publication, as dangerous to the cauſe, not only of Proteſtantiſm, but of Chriſtianity itſelf; we need not be ſurpriſed, that men of inferior talents, and leſs acquainted with the ſcience of criticiſm, ſhould look on the edition of the Old Teſtament by Kennicot, or of the New by Mill, or by Wetſtein, as, at leaſt, a very hazardous experiment. Yet, now that the experiment has been made, is there any appearance of thoſe evils which have been dreaded from it? I am not ſenſible that there is. It is true, that Kennicot's publication of the Old Teſtament is ſo recent, that we have ſcarcely yet had time to diſcover its conſequences; but if we may judge from the reception given to the New, we have no ground to fear them. Mill's work has been now in the hands of the Public for more than half a century, and Wetſtein's for not much leſs. Yet it is not in my power to diſcover that, in the judgment of any reaſonable man, or even in the judgment of the people, the cauſe of Chriſtianity has ſuffered by theſe publications. I know that the moſt enlightened readers have judged them to be, in many reſpects, of ſervice to the cauſe: and the opinion of the moſt enlightened, where there is no interference of ſecular motives, or of violent meaſures, will always prove at laſt the opinion of the generality.

Soon after Mill's edition appeared, which was about the beginning of the preſent century, the various readings of the New Teſtament became a topic for declamation to ſceptics and free-thinkers. There needed but a little time, in which men might canvaſs thoſe variations, to convince every perſon who reflected, that there was nothing terrible in the caſe. Accordingly, he would now be deemed but a ſorry advocate for the infidel hypotheſis, who ſhould have recourſe to an argument which, if allowed to have any validity, would ſubvert our belief in all hiſtory whatever, as well as in that of the Goſpels; for the writings of the Old and New Teſtament have not been expoſed to more hazards from tranſcribers, than other ancient writings. Now, if any one ſhould ſay, We can believe nothing in ancient hiſtory, on account of the variations to be found in the different editions and manuſcripts of the different authors, no man of common ſenſe would think him fit to be argued with. Yet there is one reaſon (without recurring to a miraculous interpoſition) to think, that we have more ſecurity of a faithful tranſmiſſion of the Scriptures, than of any compoſition merely human. The ſuppoſed ſacredneſs of the former, ſerves as a guard to them, and makes at leaſt the greater part of tranſcribers afraid to take thoſe freedoms with them which they would, without ſcruple, take with other writings. The exceſſive, nay, even ſuperſtitious, ſcrupuloſity, which has given riſe to ſo many abſurdly literal verſions of Scripture, is a ſtrong preſumption of the truth of what I ſay.

Thoſe who conſider religion as no other than a political

lical engine, have reaſon, I own, to be alarmed. But thoſe, on the contrary, who are perſuaded that the religion of Jeſus is founded in truth, and conſequently divine, are inexcuſable in their fears of canvaſſing it as much as poſſible. It is falſehood, not truth; it is guilt, not innocence, which ſtudiouſly excludes the light, and flies examination. This our reaſon teaches; this our religion alſo teaches. *For whoſoever doth evil*, ſays our Lord*, *hateth the light, and ſhunneth it, leſt his deeds ſhould be detected. But he who obeyeth the truth, cometh to the light, that it may be manifeſt that his actions are agreeable to God.* Fears of this kind, in theſe latter ages (for from the beginning they were not), originated with the Romaniſts. The Proteſtants thought they ſaw clearly the reaſon of their apprehenſions on this ſubject, and were not ſurpriſed at them. The meaſures employed by the party were all of a piece, and not badly ſuited to the end they had in view. Such were their *index expurgatorius*, their inquiſitions, their licenſers of books, their prohibitions, and other methods, for diſcouraging tranſlations of the Scriptures, and for preventing the people's becoming acquainted with them. Of ſuch meaſures the ſecret ſprings, as well as the manifeſt tendency, furniſhed ample matter of declamation to the adverſaries of the Romiſh eſtabliſhment.

It is not with pleaſure that I add, but impartiality obliges me, for it is too true, that when matters in any place took ſuch a turn, as to throw the ſecular power into the hands of any party of ſuch adverſaries; thoſe of that party too often betrayed a propenſity to recur to ſome of the meaſures they had before ſo univerſally and ſo loudly reprobated. We may, however, now, with ſome confidence, affirm, that it is rather too late a period in the age of the world, to think of ſuch odious expedients. By the invention of printing, and by the many diſcoveries and improvements which have extended the intercourſe of nations, the acquiſition of knowledge is, at preſent, ſo much facilitated and accelerated, in all civilized countries, that it will not be checked in its progreſs, nor will truth be overborne, by thoſe expedients which were found fully ſufficient for the purpoſe formerly. Nay, ſo evident is this become, that even that formidable power, which ſo long made ignorance a principal engine of government, ſeems compelled, at length, to ſhift her ground, and to appear among the foremoſt in patronizing what muſt conduce to the furtherance of knowledge.

It is little more than two centuries ſince the authenticity of the Vulgate verſion was formally affirmed, by a decree of the council of Trent. Immediately after that ſentence, it appears to have been the prevalent opinion of zealous Romaniſts, that that tranſlation ought to be conſidered as inſpired, and conſequently as abſolutely faultleſs. On this account, the champions of the party did not heſitate to exalt it far above the original, which, though they acknowledged to have been inſpired, they affirmed to have been, ſince that time, miſerably corrupted, in paſſing through the hands of collators and copiſts. In about a century after, how much more moderate the opinions, even of Romaniſts, were become, appears ſufficiently from what we are informed of, on this ſubject, in Simon's Critical Hiſtory. The high ſtyle, ſo common with former theologians and controvertiſts, was heard no more. All moderate and judicious Romaniſts were aſhamed of it. The prevalent opinion of ſuch was then, what no reaſonable Proteſtant will diſſent from at this day, that, in every thing eſſential to the faith and practice of a Chriſtian, it was a good verſion, and might be ſafely uſed. "Opinionum commenta delet dies." Let not the hand of power interfere; let there be neither bribes nor terrors, to bias the mind on either ſide, and men of the moſt oppoſite factions will ſoon become reaſonable, and learn to underſtand one another. Free and fair diſcuſſion will ever be found the firmeſt friend to the truth. At the time I ſpeak of, the moſt moderate of the Roman Catholic party were, however, convinced that, in deference to the council's declaration, every true ſon of the church, who purpoſed to tranſlate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, for the uſe of the people, ought to tranſlate from the Vulgate verſion only. What, then, would thoſe people have thought of a new tranſlation into Latin, by one of their own prieſts, from the original Hebrew and Greek? They had ſome ſpecious grounds, I acknowledge, for conſidering it as preſumptuous, at leaſt in the appearance which it has, of ſetting up the opinion of an individiual, in oppoſition to the declared judgment of the church. Yet in little more than half a century after the publication of the Critical Hiſtory, another prieſt of the Oratory undertook, and with the pope's approbation, executed, a new tranſlation of the Old Teſtament from the original into Latin, in which he corrects the errors of the Vulgate, with as much freedom as any candid Proteſtant could have done. Is there not reaſon, then, to ſay, that Rome ſeems to have changed her meaſures? How great was the encouragement which was given lately by the moſt eminent perſonages in that church, to the labours of an Engliſh Proteſtant, who undertook to give the public a more correct edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, with the various readings, than the Chriſtian world had enjoyed before?

But if Rome, from whatever motive it may ariſe, ſhall now, at length, judge it proper to contribute to the advancement of knowledge, and aſſiſt in furniſhing the world with light and information; is it incumbent on Proteſtants, in oppoſition to all their former maxims, to do their utmoſt to with-hold the light,

* Jo. iii. 20, 21.

and involve matters, as much as poſſible, in darkneſs? Might it not in that caſe, be juſtly concluded, that they were actuated, not by the love of truth, but by the ſpirit of faction; and that they had become, at laſt, enemies to the light, finding upon further enquiry, that the light was no friend to their cauſe? As no judicious Proteſtant can ſeriouſly think that there is ground for ſuſpecting this, let not any one act as if he ſuſpected it. If there were ground for ſuſpicion, this, itſelf, would be an additional reaſon for enquiry; unleſs we are abſurd enough to be more attached to a ſect than to truth; and to have more of that bigotry, and implicit faith, which are of the eſſence of ſuperſtition, than we have of genuine religion, which is ever found a reaſonable ſervice, and as completly amiable as the other is hateful.

Yet is there not, even in ſome who are the friends of truth, and the friends of freedom, who, in religion, as in other matters, would give ſcope to enquiry and communication, a ſort of jealouſy, on the article of tranſlation, which makes them leſs equitable, leſs candid, judges, in regard to it, than in regard to any other matter that comes under their diſcuſſion? They are jealous for the honour of the common verſion; and, though they are far from aſcribing any ſupernatural power to the tranſlators, they are afraid of the detection of any error which might make that verſion ſink in the opinion of the people. 'This,' ſay they, 'could not be productive of a good effect, either on 'the faith of the nation, or on their practice; for, as 'the people cannot be ſuppoſed nice in diſtinguiſhing; 'their Bible, and their religion, are to them the ſame 'thing. By diſcrediting the one, ye injure the other; 'and, by introducing queſtions about the proper ren-'dering of a particular paſſage, ye weaken the effect of 'the whole.' As there is ſome plauſibility in this method of arguing, I beg leave to offer a few more thoughts on the ſubject.

In every queſtion relating to fact, where experience may be had, our ſafeſt recourſe is to experience. Since the beginning of the ſixteenth century, many Latin tranſlations of the Bible, of very different characters, have been publiſhed. Can we juſtly ſay that, by means of theſe, the authority of Scripture, among thoſe who do not underſtand the original, but are readers of theſe verſions, has been weakened, and ſcepticiſm has been promoted? I do not think that, with any ſhadow of reaſon, this can be aſſerted. If people will but reflect, they will ſoon be ſenſible that it is not among the readers of Scripture, either in the original, or in tranſlations, that thoſe evils chiefly abound. But there are many other ſpecies of reading, and many other cauſes to be traced, by which the effects above mentioned may be amply accounted for. To me it is evident, that of all ſorts of reading and ſtudy, that of the Scriptures is the moſt innocent of thoſe evil conſequences. So the ſacred writers, themſelves, have thought, by whom this reading is often and warmly recommended, and not only reading the Scriptures, but ſearching into them, and meditating on them. Now, thoſe who ſeriouſly comply with theſe injunctions, will never reject any aid by which they may be enabled to diſcover what lies deeper than the ſurface; ſo, alſo, have thought thoſe pious men celebrated in Scripture, as having drawn much profit and delight from this exerciſe. I would not ſay ſo much for the reading of theological controverſy; yet I would not that men, who liked this ſpecies of reading, were reſtrained from uſing it. The accidental bad conſequences which may accrue to individuals, from any literary purſuit, are of no conſideration, compared with the general advantage reſulting from the liberty of ſearch and free communication of knowledge. No perſon would think it better for the world that all men were enſlaved, becauſe ſome men make a very bad uſe of their freedom.

On the firſt publication of Eraſmus's tranſlation of the new Teſtament into Latin, much offence was taken by many, and diſmal apprehenſions were entertained, of the hurt it would do to the cauſe of religion and Chriſtianity. Even men who were eſteemed both moderate and judicious, ſeemed to think that it was, at leaſt, a hazardous experiment. This experiment, however, has been tried, not only by him, but by ſeveral others ſince his time. Yet there is not one, as far as I can learn, who has pretended to deduce from that, or any other tranſlation, the irreligion and incredulity of the times.

To come to our own caſe: Have the attempts which have been made in this iſland, I may almoſt ſay, ſince the days of Wickliff, to tranſlate the Scriptures into Engliſh, ever been found to leſſen their authority? I have not heard this affirmed by any body. Yet every new verſion altered, and pretended to correct, many things in thoſe which had preceded. But whatever may be the private judgment of individuals, concerning the comparative merit of the different tranſlations, we cannot diſcover any traces of evidence, that their number did, in the ſmalleſt degree, derogate from the veneration for holy writ generally entertained by the people. Againſt the common tranſlation, in uſe at preſent, which was made and authoriſed in the beginning of the reign of James the Firſt, there were preciſely the ſame exceptions taken, founded in the like apprehenſions of pernicious conſequences. Whoever will conſult the preface of that tranſlation, and read the paragraph which is titled on the margin, *The ſpeeches and reaſons both of our brethren and of our adverſaries againſt this work*; will be ſurpriſed to find how much they coincide with what has been thrown out, of late, againſt any new attempt of the ſame kind. It is remarkable that, from the days of Jerom to the preſent, the ſame terrible forebodings have always accompanied the under-

undertaking, and vaniſhed on the execution, inſomuch that the fatal effects predicted, have never afterwards been heard of.

Now, to take the matter in another view; the cauſe aſſigned is nowiſe adequate to the effect. If the different ways of rendering one paſſage may make the unlearned doubtful with regard to the meaning of that paſſage, the perfect harmony of the different interpreters, as far as regards the ſenſe, in many more paſſages; nay, I may juſtly ſay, in every thing that can be conſidered as eſſential in the hiſtory and doctrine, ſerves as the ſtrongeſt confirmation of theſe in particular. The different tranſlators are like ſo many different touchſtones. Thoſe truths which can ſtand ſuch numerous trials, are rendered quite indubitable. I know not any, even of the common people, that are poſſeſſed of an ordinary meaſure of underſtanding, who need to be told, that it is in the meaning, and not in the ſound, that the doctrine of the Goſpel lies: or, as the Engliſh tranſlators have well expreſſed it: "Is the kingdom "of God become words or ſyllables? Why ſhould "we be in bondage to them, if we may be free?" When people find thoſe tranſlations, though differing in words, yet, in every thing material, agreeing in ſenſe, they prove to them, as was hinted before, like ſo many different witneſſes, each in his own ſtyle, and in his own manner, atteſting the ſame things, the great truths of our religion. They are witneſſes, who perfectly agree in the import of their teſtimony: their differences in expreſſion, far from derogating, in the judgment of any ſenſible reader, from their veracity, ſerve to eſtabliſh it, and, conſequently, prove confirmations of the facts atteſted. Various tranſlations are, therefore, upon the whole, much better calculated for confirming, than for weakening, the faith of the unlearned.

Has the margin, in the Engliſh Bible, which, in a very great number of paſſages, gives every reader his choice of different tranſlations, ever been found to endanger the faith of the people? or, has it ever been ſuggeſted to have the ſame tendency with the arguments of the deiſts? Yet what ſhould more readily, upon the principles of thoſe gentlemen, with whom I am arguing, have produced this effect, than the confeſſion (for their margin manifeſtly implies no leſs) of thoſe learned men who were employed in the work, of the numerous doubts which they had to encounter in the execution. They have honeſtly told their doubts, and, as far as I know, were never ſuſpected of having done any hurt to the cauſe by this ingenious conduct. On the other hand, I am ſorry to obſerve men of knowledge, diſcernment, and probity, appearing in ſupport of meaſures which ſeem to proceed on the ſuppoſition, that a ſort of diſingenuous policy muſt be uſed with the people for the defence of the truth. However neceſſary diſſimulation and pious frauds, as they are called, may be for the ſupport of falſe, I have never ſeen them of any ſervice to true, religion. If not treacherous, they are dangerous, allies, at the beſt.

That one verſion expreſſes the ſentiment more intelligibly, more perſpicuouſly, or more emphatically, than another, will indeed occaſion its being read with more pleaſure, and even more profit; but it will never, on that account, be conſidered, by any, as giving a contradictory teſtimony. Yet it is ſuch oppoſition of evidence that is the only circumſtance which can affect the veracity of holy writ, and, conſequently, the credit given to it by the people. And ſurely, whatever can, on the contrary, be rendered conducive to the emolument of the reader, cannot be prejudicial to the cauſe of religion, or diſreſpectful to the word of God, which does not conſiſt in the words of any tranſlation, but in the dictates of the divine Spirit.

The words of a tranſlation that has been long in common uſe, have an advantage, of which they cannot be of a ſudden diveſted. The advantage reſults from this very circumſtance, that it has been long in general uſe, and men are familiarized to its expreſſions. But, notwithſtanding this, it may have conſiderable faults; it may, in ſeveral places, be obſcure; and though it ſhould very rarely convey a falſe ſenſe, it may be often ambiguous. In this caſe, a new verſion will be of great utility, if it were but for rendering the old more intelligible. For my part, I ſhall think my labour more than ſufficiently recompenſed, if, by the pious and the impartial, I ſhall be judged to expreſs no extravagant opinion, and to form no preſumptuous hope, when I ſay, in the words which Eraſmus employed on a ſimilar occaſion: "Illa [Vulgata editio] legatur "in ſcholis, canatur in templis, citetur in concionibus, "nullus obſtat. Illud auſim polliceri, quiſquis hanc "noſtram domi legerit, ſuam rectius intellecturus*."

Some, perhaps, are ready to interpoſe, 'If tranſla-'tions were to be uſed only as private helps for un-'derſtanding the Scriptures, as commentaries and 'paraphraſes are uſed, they would not be objected to: 'but what has alarmed the minds of men, on this ar-'ticle, is that, of late, ſome attempts have been made 'to perſuade the public of the need there is for a new 'and more correct tranſlation of the Bible, with the 'ſanction of the higher powers, for the uſe of churches.' As to any project of this kind, I can ſay very little, as I know not, in particular, what is projected: at the ſame time I muſt acknowledge that, in the general view, it appears to me a very delicate point. To eſtabliſh a verſion of Scripture by human authority, to be uſed by the people (without any regard had to their ſentiments) in the public ſervice of God, to the expreſs excluſion of every other verſion, is a meaſure, about the propriety of which, at any time, I am far from being ſatisfied. The public uſe of particular tranſlations of the Bible in the churches, Oriental and Occidental, for many centuries, took its riſe, ſolely, from the general

* Eraſm. in Apolog.

neral uſe private: and, to this private uſe, no doubt, the favourable opinion of the paſtors, ſuch, eſpecially, as were eminent for piety and learning, greatly contributed. But then, the effect was produced gradually and tacitly; in conſequence of which, it appeared the reſult of the people's free choice, though not formally declared, well enough underſtood. It was in this way, certainly, that the old Italic firſt came into uſe in the Latin church; and it was in this way, from the growing predilection of the people, that the preſent Vulgate came at length to ſupplant it. It was fortunate for the ſucceſs of Jerom's verſion, that no ſanguine patron ſtood forth to puſh it into notice, and that no law was made commanding its reception, and prohibiting the public uſe of the Italic. Though men's opinions and attachments, even in matters which do not ſo deeply affect them as religion, cannot, at the command of a ſuperior, be changed in a moment, the ſame effect will often, by proper means, be produced in a gentle and gradual manner. When the Italic was firſt introduced, there was probably no other Latin tranſlation of any account. In conſequence of this, and of that deſire of religious inſtruction, which univerſally animated the primitive Chriſtians, they would receive it with joy. To read it to them, would be highly to gratify them; for we ought to reflect, that books were then matters of very difficult acquirement, compared to what they are now. But when the introduction of one book was the diſpoſſeſſion of another, to which they had been long accuſtomed, and were, from habit, warmly attached, the caſe was very different. Yet even this effect, which, it is probable, would not have been produced by ſtronger meaſures, was ſilently, and (as it were) imperceptibly, brought about by time. If, in ſome places, tumults were occaſioned by the change, this, I ſuſpect, when impartially examined, will be found imputable, more to the raſhneſs and imprudence of the paſtors, than to any want of docility in the people. Immediately after the Reformation, the opportunity was very favourable for procuring, among thoſe who favoured the meaſures of the Reformers, a welcome reception to any verſion of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, which had the approbation of the heads of the party. If gratified in the thing chiefly wanted, they would not be critical as to the mode of introduction; and if, from the changes in their rulers, there had been ſome changes, in relation to the Scriptures to be read in the congregation, what was eſtabliſhed, in ſome places, was of ſo ſhort continuance, that the mind could hardly be ſaid to be pre-occupied by it.

But the caſe, at preſent, is widely different. Learning is in more hands. Critics are multiplied. The preſs is open; and every cavil, as well as every argument, is quickly circulated. Beſides, the prepoſſeſſion, in favour of the tranſlation to which we have been ſo long habituated, is, at this day, very ſtrong. Add to all this, that the religious, as well as the civil, rights of mankind were never better underſtood; the genuine principles of toleration had never greater influence. How, then, ſhould we be affected, upon hearing that we are commanded, under pains and penalties, by our ſuperiors, to read, and cauſe to be read in our churches, ſuch a particular tranſlation of the Bible only, and never more to admit into the ſacred ſervice, that verſion to which we have been hitherto, all our lives, accuſtomed, and for which we have contracted a high veneration. For my part, I will not diſſemble the matter; I ſhould think ſuch a meaſure exceedingly incongruous to the ſpirit of that religion which the legiſlators, perhaps, intended to ſerve by it; and no leſs unſeaſonable, in reſpect of the age and country wherein we live. I perfectly agree with Tertullian, that religion, and coercion of any kind, are utterly incompatible. "Humani juris et naturalis "poteſtatis eſt, unicuique quod putaverit, colere." Again: "Nec religionis eſt cogere religionem, quæ "ſponte ſuſcipi debeat, non vi." I cordially ſubſcribe to the ſentiment of Lactantius, who deems it eſſential to the value of every thing in religious ſervice, in reſpect both of the object, and of the mode, that it be voluntary: "Nihil eſt tam voluntarium quam religio, "in qua ſi animus ſacrificantis averſus eſt, jam ſublata, "jam nulla eſt." Nor does it make any difference in the nature of the thing, whether the power that would compel us, be called civil or eccleſiaſtical.

But, is there nothing, then, which can, with propriety, be attempted by the higher powers, ſpiritual or temporal, for promoting the ſucceſs of an accurate tranſlation of the Bible? The utmoſt which, in my judgment, can be done, if ſuch a verſion ſhould, in any future period, be offered to the Public, is to remove the obſtructions which thoſe powers have heretofore raiſed to prevent its introduction, and to permit, not command, the uſe of it, wherever it ſhall be found agreeable to the people, and judged, by the paſtors, to be edifying. In the reign of Chriſtian charity, which ſubſiſted in times truly primitive and apoſtolical, it was not neceſſary that the limits of juriſdiction and authority ſhould be ſo accurately aſcertained, as afterwards, when love began to give place to ambition and ſecular proſpects. Eſteem and love are unſuſpicious. In ſuch a ſtate of things, the opinion of no perſons would go ſo far with the congregation, as that of their paſtors; nor would the paſtors know any motive ſo powerful, as that of contributing to the edification of the people. 'But,' it will be objected, 'to 'leave things in this manner, would appear like giving 'a ſanction to different tranſlations at the ſame time.' If it ſhould, I can perceive no abſurdity in ſuch a ſanction; no evil conſequence that would follow from it. In fact, would it be any more, with reſpect to the whole Bible, than that which has long obtained in England, with regard to one conſiderable book, the

Pſalms

Pſalms, of which two very different verſions, one in the Bible, the other in the Common Prayer, have equally the ſanction of the higher powers? Are the people ignorant of this difference? Thoſe who know any thing of the religion of the country, who read their Bible at home, and attend the ſervice of the church, know it perfectly. Yet I have not heard that any private Chriſtian was ſcandalized at it; much leſs, that any one pretended to deduce, from this cauſe, the libertiniſm and infidelity of the times. Yet, in no part of Scripture would the people have ſo many opportunities of remarking the variations, as in that book, which they hear in church not ſeldomer than twelve times a-year. So much cannot be ſaid of any other part of the ſacred volume, the New Teſtament being read only thrice a-year, and the Old Teſtament but once. If the people were ſo eaſily alarmed, as ſome ſeem to imagine, how has it happened, that the ſtriking differences between the two authoriſed tranſlations, above mentioned, have not, long ere now, raiſed a clamour, either againſt the common tranſlation, or againſt the Common Prayer?

I ſhould not have thought it neceſſary to ſay any thing on this head, if the ſubject had not been ſtarted of late, and warmly agitated (I believe with the beſt intentions on both ſides), by ſome learned and worthy men. As my ſentiments, on the ſubject, do not entirely coincide with thoſe of either party, I thought it incumbent to add the explanation now given. The publiſhing of a new tranſlation is not to be conſidered as implying a condemnation of any that preceded. This was objected to thoſe employed by James the Firſt, in preparing the tranſlation uſed at preſent; and the reply which thoſe tranſlators made to their opponents in this buſineſs, as it had ſerved Jerom before them, and ſerved them, will equally ſerve me, or any tranſlator, who ſhall afterwards beſtow his time and labour in the ſame way. "We anſwer them," ſay they, "with St. Hierom, *Do we condemn the ancient? In no "caſe; but, after the endeavours of them that were be-"fore us, we take the beſt pains we can in the houſe of God.* "As if he ſaid, Being provoked, by the example of "the learned, that lived before my time, I have thought "it my duty to aſſay whether my talent, in the know-"ledge of the tongues, may be profitable, in any mea-"ſure, to God's church, leſt I ſhould ſeem to have "laboured in them in vain, and leſt I ſhould be "thought to glory in men (although ancient) above "that which was in them." So ſaid thoſe worthy men, who, as they did not think themſelves precluded from making improvements on the valuable labours of their predeceſſors, ſhow ſufficiently that they did not conſider their own labours as ſuperſeding all attempts at ſtill farther improvements, by thoſe who ſhould come after them.

The due conſideration of the progreſſive ſtate of all human knowledge and arts, will ever be unfriendly to the adoption of any meaſure which ſeems to fix a barrier againſt improvement, and to ſay to ſcience, *Thus far thou ſhalt come, and no farther.* And if, in matters merely of ſcience, ſuch meaſures would prove hurtful, how much more in any thing wherein religion is concerned? My opinion, therefore, on this queſtion, I freely acknowledge, favours the removal of all legal reſtraints, as much as poſſible, and not barely the change of the object. Indeed, this will be found the natural reſult of the argument, as it has heretofore been conducted. There is not a topic, which the preſent adverſaries of an improved tranſlation in Engliſh, employ now, which was not, with the ſame plauſibility, employed againſt Jerom's Latin tranſlation, called the Vulgate, at preſent in univerſal uſe in the Latin Church, and which was not alſo employed againſt the Engliſh tranſlation of James the Firſt, that very verſion for which our adverſaries, on this article, now ſo ſtrenuouſly contend. On the other hand there was not any plea, which Jerom urged in ſupport of his attempt, or which the the Engliſh tranſlators urged in ſupport of theirs, that will not equally ſerve the purpoſe of any preſent or future well-meant attempt of the the like kind, and, conſequently, that does not ſtrike againſt every meaſure which might effectually preclude any ſuch attempt in time to come.

There are only two differences, in point of circumſtances, between us and the inhabitants of this iſland, in the beginning of the laſt century, which impartiality obliges me to mention, and which (as they render more delicacy requiſite in theſe days, than was neceſſary in thoſe), if attended to, may prevent men from concluding too haſtily, that thoſe meaſures cannot fail of ſucceſs now, which have ſucceeded formerly. Though ſome verſions had been publicly authoriſed before that of James the Firſt, none of them had been of near ſo long ſtanding, as that which is in uſe at preſent; and, conſequently, the people's attachment to any one of them, was not ſo much ſtrengthened by habit, as the preſent attachment to the Engliſh Bible may be ſuppoſed to be. An alteration, therefore, in reſpect of the public uſe, might be a much more difficult attempt now than it was then. The other difference ariſes from the conſideration, that the ſpirit of liberty is much higher, at preſent, in the nation, than it was at that period; the rights of conſcience are better underſtood, and the abſurdity, as well as tyranny, of employing coercion, in matters of religion, are almoſt univerſally acknowledged.

nearly affects the rights of conſcience. For my own part, it is enough for me, that common ſenſe aſſures me, that, if God condeſcends to ſpeak to us mortals, it is our duty to attend to what he ſays; and if, in any

All theſe conſiderations, whilſt they give the utmoſt encouragemement to the ſtudy of biblical criticiſm, ſhow ſufficiently, the danger of all meaſures that can be juſtly accounted compulſory, in a matter that ſo

writing,

writing, he has revealed his will to us, it is our duty carefully to read that writing, and do our utmoſt rightly to underſtand it. The language of the Chriſtian revelation, we quickly ſee, concurs with that of reaſon, in enjoining this practice; nay, it excites us ſtill more ſtrongly, by the example it ſets before us, of thoſe who have found much comfort and improvement in it. Can I require ſtronger motives to induce me to make God's word the ſubject of my ſtudy and meditation, day and night? And if I have reaſon to think that, by the bleſſing of Heaven, I have been, in ſome meaſure, ſucceſsful in this application of my time, does not our common Chriſtianity, one of the great commandments of which is, *Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf*, oblige me, for the benefit of others, to communicate any lights I may have received from this exerciſe? When they are communicated, I have diſcharged a Chriſtian duty. The reception will be ſuch as it pleaſes Providence to give them.

Though, in theſe volumes, I have not affirmed any thing, as my opinion, which did not at the time, and does not ſtill, appear to me probable; and though many things in them, appear certain, I deſire nothing to be admitted, by the reader, upon my affirmation: my wiſh is, that every thing may be candidly and deliberately examined; that my reaſons, which I commonly give, where the ſubject requires it, may be impartially weighed, and the opinion adopted, or rejected, as the reader, on due reflection, ſhall find cauſe. If to make proſelytes by the ſword, is tyranny in rulers, to reſign our underſtanding to any man, and receive, implicitly, what we ought to be rationally convinced of, would be, on our part, the loweſt ſervility. Now, *tyranny* and *ſervility*, how much ſoever adapted to the genius of worldly domination, are by no means ſuited to the heavenly character of Chriſt's kingdom. The only means the Goſpel itſelf permits us to employ, for promoting this ſpiritual power, is *perſuaſion*, which operates upon the underſtanding, and, by it, upon the will and the affections: the great engine of ſecular dominion is *force*, which, without regarding underſtanding, will, or affections, lays hold of the body. The language of our Lord to his hearers, was, *If any man* WILL *come under my guidance;* Ει τις ΘΕΛΕΙ οπισω μου ελθειν. Nothing is obtruded or forced upon the unwilling. Now, as the great ſource of the infidelity of the Jews, was a notion of the temporal kingdom of the Meſſiah, we may juſtly ſay, that the great ſource of the corruption of Chriſtians, and of their general defection, foretold by the inſpired writers, has been an attempt to render it, in effect, a temporal kingdom, and to ſupport and extend it by earthly means. This is that ſpirit of Antichriſt, which was ſo early at work, as to be diſcoverable even in the days of the apoſtles.

Every thing, therefore, here, is ſubjected to the teſt of Scripture and ſound criticiſm. I am not very confident of my own reaſonings. I am ſenſible that, on many points, I have changed my opinion, and found reaſon to correct what I had judged formerly to be right. The conſciouſneſs of former miſtakes, proves a guard to preſerve me from ſuch a preſumptuous confidence in my preſent judgment, as would preclude my giving a patient hearing to whatever may be urged, from reaſon or Scripture, in oppoſition to it. TRUTH has been, in all my inquiries, and ſtill is, my great aim. To her I am ready to ſacrifice every perſonal conſideration; but am determined not, knowingly, to ſacrifice her to any thing. To Lucian's advice to the hiſtoriographer, Μονη θυτεον τη αληθεια, which I have inſcribed in the title, it is my intention ſacredly to adhere.

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS.

DISSERTATION THE FIRST.

Obſervations on the Language and Idiom of the New Teſtament, on the Diverſity of Style, and on the Inſpiration of the Sacred Writers.

PART I.

The Language and Idiom.

IF the words and phraſes employed by the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts in delivering the revelation committed to them by the Holy Spirit, had not been agreeable to the received uſage of the people to whom they ſpoke, their diſcourſes being unintelligible, could have conveyed no information, and conſequently would have been no revelation to the hearers. Our Lord and his Apoſtles, in publiſhing the Goſpel, firſt addreſſed themſelves to their countrymen the Jews; a people who had, many ages before, at different periods, been favoured with other revelations. To thoſe ancient Jewiſh revelations, now collected into one volume, Chriſtians give the name of the Old Teſtament; and thereby diſtinguiſh them from thoſe apoſtolical and evangelical writings, which being alſo collected into one volume, are called the New Teſtament. In the latter diſpenſation, the divine authority of the former is preſuppoſed and founded on. The knowledge of what is contained in that introductory revelation, is always preſumed in the readers of the New Teſtament, which claims to be the conſummation of an economy of God for the ſalvation of man; of which economy the Old Teſtament acquaints us with the occaſion, origin, and early progreſs. Both are therefore intimately connected. Accordingly, though the two Teſtaments are written in different languages, the ſame idiom prevails in both; and in the hiſtorical part at leaſt, nearly the ſame character of ſtyle.

§ 2. As the writings of the Old Teſtament are of a much earlier date, and contain an account of the riſe and firſt eſtabliſhment, together with a portion of the hiſtory of the nation to whom the Goſpel was firſt promulged, and of whom were all its firſt miſſionaries and teachers, it is thence unqueſtionably that we muſt learn, both what the principal facts, cuſtoms, doctrines, and precepts are, that are alluded to in the apoſtolical writings, and what is the proper ſignification and extent of the expreſſions uſed. Though the New Teſtament is written in Greek, an acquaintance with the Greek claſſics (that is, with the writings of profane authors in that tongue in proſe and verſe) will not be found ſo conducive to this end, as an acquaintance with the ancient Hebrew ſcriptures. I am far from denying that claſſical knowledge is, even for this purpoſe, of real utility; I ſay only, that it is not of ſo great utility as the other. It is well known that the Jews were diſtinguiſhed by all Pagan antiquity, as a nation of moſt extraordinary and peculiar manners; as abſolutely incapable of coaleſcing with other people, being actuated, eſpecially in matters wherein religion or politics were thought to be concerned, by the moſt unrelenting averſion to every thing foreign, and the moſt violent attachment to every thing national. We cannot have a clearer evidence of the juſtneſs of this character, than their remaining to this day a diſtinct people, who, though they have been for many ages

ſcattered over the face of the earth, have never yet been blended in any country with the people amongſt whom they lived. They are, beſides, the only wandering nation that ever exiſted of which this can be affirmed.

§ 3. BEFORE the tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned from captivity in Babylon to the land of their fathers, their language, as was inevitable, had been adulterated, or rather changed, by their ſojourning ſo long among ſtrangers. They called it Hebrew, availſelves of an ambiguous name*. It is accordingly always called Hebrew in the New Teſtament. This, though but a ſmall circumſtance, is characteriſtical of the people, who could not brook the avowal of changing their language and adopting that of ſtrangers, even when they could not avoid being conſcious of the thing. The dialect which they then ſpoke might have been more properly ſtyled Chaldee, or even Syriac, than Hebrew. But to give it either of theſe appellations, had appeared to them as admitting what would always remind both themſelves and others of their ſervitude. After the Macedonian conqueſts, and the diviſion which the Grecian empire underwent among the commanders on the death of their chief, Greek ſoon became the language of the people of rank through all the extenſive dominions which had been ſubdued by Alexander. The perſecutions with which the Jews were harraſſed under Antiochus Epiphanes, concurring with ſeveral other cauſes, occaſioned the diſperſion of a great part of their nation throughout the provinces of Aſia Minor, Aſſyria, Phenicia, Perſia, Arabia, Lybia, and Egypt; which diſperſion was in proceſs of time extended to Achaia, Macedonia, and Italy. The unavoidable conſequence of this was in a few ages, to all thoſe who ſettled in diſtant lands, the total loſs of that dialect which their fathers had brought out of Babylon into Paleſtine. But this is to be underſtood with the exception of the learned who ſtudied the oriental languages by book. At length a complete verſion of the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament was made into Greek; a language which was then, and continued for many ages afterwards, in far more general uſe than any other. This is what is called the Septuagint or verſion of the *Seventy* (probably becauſe approved by the Sanhedrim) which was begun (as has been ſaid) by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus king of Egypt, for the uſe of the Alexandrian library. At firſt no more than the Pentateuch was tranſlated, which was ſoon followed by a verſion of the other books. This is doubtleſs the firſt tranſlation that was attempted of the Sacred Writings.

§ 4. IT will readily be imagined that all the Jews who inhabited Grecian cities, where the oriental tongues were unknown, would be ſolicitous to obtain copies of this tranſlation. To excite in them this ſolicitude, patriotiſm would concur with piety, and indeed almoſt every motive that can operate upon men. In one view their Bible was more to them than ours is to us. It is religion alone, I may ſay, that influences our regard; whereas their ſacred books contained not only their religious principles and holy ceremonies, but the whole body of their municipal laws†. They contained an account of their political conſtitution, and their civil hiſtory, that part eſpecially which is moſt intereſting, the lives of their Patriarchs, and the gradual advancement of that family from whom they gloried to be deſcended; the hiſtory of their eſtabliſhment as a nation; the exploits, victories, and conqueſts of their anceſtors; the lives and atchievements of their kings and heroes, prophets and reformers. Nay more, the Scriptures might be juſtly conſidered as a collection of the writings, both proſaic and poetical, of all the moſt eminent authors their country had produced. A copy of ſuch a verſion was therefore, in every view we can take of it, an ineſtimable treaſure to every Jew who underſtood Greek, and could not read the original. And hence we may eaſily conceive that the copies would ſoon be greatly multiplied, and widely ſcattered.

§ 5. LET us attend to the conſequences that would naturally follow. Wherever Greek was the mother-tongue, this verſion would come to be uſed not only in private in Jewiſh houſes, but alſo in public in their ſchools and ſynagogues, in the explanation of the weekly leſſons from the law and the prophets. The ſtyle of it would conſequently ſoon become the ſtandard of language to them on religious ſubjects. Hence would ariſe a certain uniformity in phraſeology and idiom among the Grecian Jews, wherever diſperſed, in regard to their religion and ſacred rites, whatever were the particular dialects which prevailed in the places of their reſidence, and were uſed by them in converſing on ordinary matters.

§ 6. THAT there was in the time of the Apoſtles a diſtinction made between thoſe Jews who uſed the Greek language and the Hebrews, or thoſe who ſpoke the language of Paleſtine and of the territory of Babylon, which they affected to call Hebrew; is manifeſt from the Acts of the Apoſtles. There ‡ we are informed, that *there aroſe a murmuring of the Grecians againſt the Hebrews, becauſe their widows were neglected in*

* *Hebrew* was ambiguous, as it might denote either the language ſpoken on the other ſide of the river (that is *Euphrates*, which is commonly meant when no river is named) or the language of the people called *Hebrews*. Preface to Matthews Goſpel, § 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

† See Lowth, De ſacra Poeſi Hebræorum, Præl. viii.

‡ Acts, vi, 1. &c.

in the daily miniſtration. That thoſe Grecians were Jews, is evident from the hiſtory: for this happened before Peter was ſpecially called to preach the goſpel to Cornelius and his family, who were the firſt fruits of the Gentiles to Chriſt. Beſides, though the word *Grecian* made uſe of in our tranſlation is ſynonymous with *Greek*, yet the term employed in the original is never applied in the New Teſtament to pagan Greeks, but ſolely to thoſe Jews who had reſided always or moſtly in Grecian cities, and conſequently whoſe common tongue was Greek. The Gentle Greeks are invariably called in Scripture Ελληνες, whereas the term uſed in the place quoted is Ελληνιſται, a word which even in claſſical authors does not mean Greeks, but *imitators of the Greeks*, or *thoſe who write or ſpeak Greek*; being a derivation from the word ελληνιζειν, *to ſpeak Greek*, or *imitate the Greeks*. The term occurs only thrice in the New Teſtament, that is in two other paſſages of the Acts beſide that now quoted. One of theſe is * where we are told that Saul, alſo called Paul, after his converſion, being at Jeruſalem, *diſputed againſt the Grecians*, προς τους Ελληνιſτας, who went about to ſlay him. This alſo happened before the converſion of Cornelius, and conſequently before the goſpel was preached to any Gentile: but as at their feſtivals there was a general concourſe of Jewiſh people at Jeruſalem from all the parts of the world into which they were diſperſed, a conſiderable number of thoſe Helleniſts or Grecizers, as in our idiom we ſhould be apt to term them, muſt have been preſent on that occaſion. The only other paſſage is where we are told †, that ſome of thoſe being Cypriots and Cyrenians, who were ſcattered abroad on the perſecution that aroſe about Stephen, *ſpake unto the Grecians* (προς τους Ελληνιſτας) at Antioch, *preaching the Lord Jeſus*. Whether this was before or after the baptiſm of Cornelius, recorded in the foregoing chapter, is not certain: but one thing is certain, that it was before thoſe diſciples could know of that memorable event. Concerning the others who were in that diſperſion, who were probably Hebrews, we are informed in the verſe immediately preceding, that in all thoſe places, Phenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, through which they went, they preached the word to none but Jews.

§ 7. The learned Baſnage makes a principal handle of this paſſage for ſupporting an opinion, which had been advanced before by Beza, that by the *Helleniſts* is meant *the proſelytes to Judaiſm*, they being contraſted here not with the *Hebrews*, but with the *Jews*. But let it be obſerved that the word Jew was not always in thoſe days uſed in the ſame ſenſe. Moſt commonly indeed it referred to the nation, in which ſenſe it was ſynonymous with Iſraelite. A man of Jewiſh extraction was not the leſs a Jew, becauſe he was neither a native nor an inhabitant of Judea, and underſtood not a ſyllable of its language. Sometimes, however, it referred to the country, in which acceptation it belonged particularly to the inhabitants of Judea or Paleſtine, including thoſe neighbouring regions wherein the ſame tongue was ſpoken. That the Samaritans (though mortally hated as ſchiſmatics) were comprehended in this application of the term Jew, is evident from what we learn from the Acts ‡, where we are informed of their being converted by Philip, and receiving the gifts of the Holy Spirit, by the hands of Peter, ſometime before the converſion of Cornelius, the firſt fruits of the Gentiles. Nay ſometimes in a ſtill more limited ſignification, it regarded only the inhabitants of the diſtrict belonging to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which had anciently conſtituted the kingdom of Judah. In this ſenſe we underſtand the word as uſed by the Evangeliſt John §, *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry* (Ιουδαια, Judea), *becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.* Yet Galilee was a part of Judea in the larger and even more common acceptation of the word, and the Galileans, of whom were the Apoſtles, were, in in every ſenſe except this confined one, Jews as well as the others. The ſame diſtinction is made between Judea and Galilee by Matthew ‖. It cannot be doubted therefore, that the term *Jews* in the paſſage under examination, ought to be underſtood in the ſecond ſenſe above mentioned, as equivalent to Hebrews.

A little attention to the caſe puts this concluſion beyond a doubt. Why ſhould they, in preaching the Goſpel, make a diſtinction between *Jews* and *proſelytes*, perſons who had received the ſeal of circumciſion, and ſubjected themſelves without reſerve to the Moſaic yoke? The law itſelf made no diſtinction; nay, it expreſsly prohibited the people from making any. ¶ *When a ſtranger ſhall ſojourn with thee, and will keep the paſſover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come near and keep it, and he ſhall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof. One law ſhall be to him that is home-born, and to the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you.* This laſt phraſe (though ſometimes uſed with greater latitude) became a common periphraſis for a proſelyte. We find accordingly that though a queſtion aroſe early in the Church, and was for a time hotly agitated, concerning the lawfulneſs of admitting the uncircumciſed to baptiſm (for ſuch was Cornelius, though no idolater), there is no hint given that the ſmalleſt doubt was entertained concerning the admiſſion of proſelytes who had already embraced the Jewiſh ritual and were circumciſed. So far from it, that the keeneſt advocates for uniting Judaiſm with Chriſtianity, inſiſted only

* Acts, ix. 29. † Acts, xi. 20. ‡ Acts, viii. 5, &c. § John, vii. 1.
‖ Matth. ii. 22. ¶ Exod. xii. 34, 49. See alſo Numb. xv. 14, 15, 16. 29.

that the Gentile converts might be circumciſed, and compelled to join the obſervance of the law of Moſes to their faith in Chriſt. Where then could be the difficulty of receiving thoſe who were already diſciples of Moſes, and had been circumciſed?—It will perhaps be retorted, "If the Chriſtians could have no ſcruple to preach to proſelytes, ſtill leſs could they have to preach to thoſe native Jews, who differed in nothing from their brethren in Paleſtine but in language." True, indeed, they could have no ſcruple; but thoſe who came at that time to Antioch, were not at all qualified for preaching in the Greek, for all had not the gift of tongues. And the hiſtorian has rendered it evident that the want of the language was the reaſon they did it not, having obſerved that thoſe who came thither and preached to the Helleniſts, were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, places where Greek was the prevailing tongue.

In regard to the murmuring mentioned in the ſixth chapter, which gave riſe to the appointment of deacons, nothing can be more improbable than Beza's hypotheſis. The number of the proſelytes of righteouſneſs, as they are ſometimes called, could not be great; for though ſeveral, like Cornelius, had been gained over from Paganiſm to the worſhip of the true God, few, comparatively, were induced to adopt the Moſaic ceremonies. Now converts of the firſt ſort were ſtill by the Jews accounted heathens, and had acceſs to no part of the temple inacceſſible to Gentiles. Of the Jewiſh proſelytes, it was a part only that was converted to Chriſtianity; and of that part, thoſe who were both widows and indigent could not ſurely be a great proportion. Further, if by Helleniſts be meant proſelytes, where was the occaſion for claſſing them ſeparately from the Jews, or for ſo much as enquiring who was a Jew by birth, and who a proſelyte? It was not agreeable, as we have ſeen, either to the ſpirit or to the letter of the law, to make ſo invidious, not to ſay odious, a diſtinction; and if not to the law, ſtill leſs, if poſſible, to the Goſpel. Whereas the diſtinction on the other hypotheſis, being founded on their uſing different languages, was not barely convenient, but neceſſary. They were claſſes of people who could not be addreſſed in the ſame tongue; and for this reaſon it was probably found expedient to employ different agents in ſupplying them. Certain it is, they were in the conſtant practice of aſſembling in different ſynagogues; for in Jeruſalem there were Greek ſynagogues for the accommodation of the Helleniſts of different nations, who came thither either occaſionally or to attend the great feſtivals, as well as Hebrew ſynagogues for the uſe of the natives. Such were moſt of thoſe mentioned in the Acts *; the Cyrenian ſynagogue and the Alexandrian,—the Cilician and the Aſian.

That Nicolas, one of the deacons elected on that occaſion, was a proſelyte, is a circumſtance of no moment in this queſtion. If four, or even three of the ſeven, had been of that denomination, it might have been pleaded with ſome plauſibility, that there muſt have been in this a deſign of deſtroying in the proſelytes all ſuſpicion of partiality. As it was, had it been they who murmured, it would have rather increaſed than diminiſhed their jealouſy, to find that they had gotten only one of their own claſs choſen for ſix of the other. This, therefore, muſt be conſidered as a circumſtance merely accidental. As to that ſingular conceit of Voſſius, that the Helleniſts were thoſe who favoured the doctrine of ſubmiſſion to a foreign yoke; as it is deſtitute alike of internal credibility and external evidence, it requires no refutation.

§ 8. So much for the diſtinction that obtained in thoſe days between Hebrew Jews and Grecian Jews, or Helleniſts; among the latter of whom, the verſion of the Seventy was in conſtant uſe. The Greek had been for ages a ſort of univerſal language in the civilized world, at leaſt among people of rank and men of letters. Cicero had with truth ſaid of it †, at the time when Rome was in her glory and Greece declining—"*Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus: Latina "ſuis finibus, exiguis ſane continentur.*" This continued to be the caſe till the time of the publication of the Goſpel, and for ſome centuries afterwards. As the Greek was then of all languages the beſt underſtood, and the moſt generally ſpoken throughout the empire, the far greater part of the New Teſtament, which contained a revelation for all mankind, was originally written in that tongue. I ſay, the far greater part, becauſe ſome critics are of opinion that the Goſpel of Matthew ‡ and the epiſtle to the Hebrews were originally written in that dialect of the Chaldee which was then the language of Jeruſalem, and by Jewiſh writers called Hebrew. It muſt be remembered that all the penmen of the New Teſtament were Jews ——the greater part Hebrews, not Helleniſts, but whether they were Hebrews or Helleniſts, as they wrote in Greek, the verſion of the Seventy would ſerve as a model in what concerned propriety of expreſſion on religious ſubjects. It was, beſides, the idiom which would be beſt underſtood by all converts to Chriſtianity from among their brethren the Jews, whereſoever ſcattered, and that whereby their writings would more perfectly harmonize with their own Scriptures, which the whole of that people had in ſo great and deſerved veneration; for let it be obſerved, that though the Jews afterwards came to loſe entirely their reſpect for the Septuagint, and even to depreciate it as an unfaithful as well as inaccurate tranſlation, this change of their ſentiments was

* Acts, vi. 9. † Pro Archia Poeta. ‡ See the Preface to that Goſpel.

was the mere effect of their disputes with the Christians, who, in arguing from it, went to the opposite extreme—considered it as the immediate work of inspiration—and in every instance wherein it differed from the original Hebrew, with which they were unacquainted, gave it the preference, treating the latter as a compilation, which had been corrupted by the Jews, in spite to Christianity. But of the high esteem which this people once entertained for that version, particularly about the time of the publication of the Gospel, their own writers, Philo and Josephus, are the most unexceptionable witnesses.

§ 9. From the conformity and peculiarity in language above taken notice of, some critics, in order to distinguish the idiom of the Septuagint and New Testament from that of common Greek, have termed it Hellenistic; not with exact propriety, I acknowledge, if we regard the etymology of the word, but with justness sufficient for the purpose of characterising the peculiar phraseology of those writings. The disputes raised on this subject by Salmasius and some others, are scarcely worth naming, as they will, upon examination, all be found to terminate in mere disputes about words. I readily admit that this speciality of diction is properly not a peculiar language, nor even a peculiar dialect, in the same sense as the *Attic*, the *Ionic*, and the Doric, are called different dialects; for there are in it no peculiarities in the inflexions of either nouns or verbs. In strictness of speech, the peculiarity does more properly constitute a difference of idiom, than either of language or of dialect. The phraseology is Hebrew, and the words are Greek. This singular manner in the ancient translators is to be considered as partly intentional and partly accidental: partly intentional, because, from the scrupulous, I may even say superstitious, attachment of the Jews not only to the words, but to the letters and syllables, to every jot and tittle of the original, they would be led to attempt a manner of translating so servilely literal as is always incompatible with purity in the language into which the translation is made;—partly accidental, because, even without design, a person speaking or writing a foreign language, frequently mingles in his speech the idioms of his native tongue. One source of the peculiarities in idiom, may have arisen from this circumstance, that the translators, though Jews, were Alexandrians. In a language spoken, as Greek was then, in many distant countries, all independent of one another, there inevitably arise peculiarities in the acceptations of words in different regions. Perhaps we ought to impute to this, that sometimes terms have been adopted by the Seventy which appear to us not the most apposite for rendering the import of the original, such as διαθηκη for ברית *berith*, and οσιος for חסיד *chasid*. But whatever be in this, the habit which the Apostles and Evangelists had of reading the Scriptures and hearing them read, whether in the original or in the ancient version, would, by infecting their style, co-operate with the tendency which, as natives of Palestine, they would derive from conversation, to intermix Hebraisms and Chaldaisms in their writings.

§ 10. It is not to be dissembled, that the sacred penmen of the New Testament have, especially in modern times, had some strenuous advocates, both among foreigners and amongst our own countrymen, who have, in my opinion, with more zeal than judgment, defended their diction, as being, when judged by the rules of grammar and rhetoric, and the practice of the most celebrated writers in Greece, altogether pure and elegant. They seem to suspect, that to yield, even on the clearest evidence, a point of this nature, though regarding ornaments merely human and exterior, might bring dishonour on inspiration, or render it questionable. I cannot help thinking that these people must have very indistinct ideas on this subject, and may be justly said to incur the reproof which Peter, on a memorable occasion, received from his Master—that *they savour more the things of men than the things of God**. Are words of any kind more than arbitrary signs? And may not the same be said with justice of phrases and idioms? Is there a natural fitness in one word or phrase more than in another, for denoting the thing signified? Is not the connexion between sounds and ideas merely artificial—the result of human, though tacit conventions? With regard to those rules which constitute purity in the language of any country, what are they in effect but the conventions which have happened to obtain among the natives, particularly those of the higher ranks?—Vulgarisms and foreign idioms, which may obtain among strangers and those of the lower ranks, have no more natural unfitness to convey the sense which they that use them intend to convey by them, than the terms and phrases which, in consequence of the preference given by their superiors, may be regarded as elegancies. It may be as reasonably objected against our religion, that the persons by whom it was propagated were chosen from what men in high life account the dregs of the people, as that the Holy Spirit should accommodate himself to the language of those who were actually chosen. Nay, language as well as dress being in fact no more than a species of mode, it may with as good reason be maintained that the ambassadors whom Christ sent for promulgating his doctrine, should have been habited like gentlemen and men of fashion, as that they should have spoken the dialect of such. Splendid style had no more connexion with the purpose of their mission than splendid apparel. The cloth which they wore, how coarse soever, answered

* Matth. xvi. 23.

ſwered all the eſſential purpoſes of clothing; the ſame may be ſaid of the language which they ſpoke. And if it be argued, that good language would create greater reſpect to their perſons, and cloſer attention to what they ſaid, and conſequently would contribute to its making a deeper impreſſion; as much may be affirmed with truth of a genteel appearance both of perſon and of dreſs. Nothing ſerves more powerfully to quaſh curioſity and expectation, and conſequently to deſtroy attention, than ſuch an external figure as generally accompanies poverty and ignorance, and ſuggeſts a total want of the advantages of education, and more eſpecially of that indiſpenſible advantage which the faſhionable world calls *ſeeing good company*.

But theſe very diſadvantages or defects, both in ſpeech and in outward figure, are aſſigned by the inſpired writers as the reaſons of God's preference, whoſe thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways. Paul argues, that the ſucceſs of the preachers of the Goſpel, in ſpite of the abſence of thoſe accompliſhments in language then ſo highly valued, was an evidence of the divine power and energy with which their miniſtry was accompanied. He did not addreſs them, he tells us*, *with the wiſdom of words* —with artificial periods and a ſtudied elocution, *leſt the croſs of Chriſt ſhould be made of none effect*—leſt to human eloquence that ſucceſs ſhould be aſcribed which ought to be attributed to the divinity of the doctrine, and the agency of the Spirit, in the miracles wrought in ſupport of it. There is hardly any ſentiment which he is at greater pains to enforce. He *uſed none of the enticing* or perſuaſive *words of man's wiſdom.—Wherefore?—That their faith might not ſtand in the wiſdom of men, but in the power of God* †. Should I aſk, What was the reaſon why our Lord Jeſus Chriſt choſe for the inſtruments of that moſt amazing revolution in the religious ſyſtems of mankind, men perfectly illiterate, and taken out of the loweſt claſs of the people? your anſwer to this will ſerve equally for an anſwer to that other queſtion—Why did the Holy Spirit chuſe to deliver ſuch important truths in the barbarous idiom of a few obſcure Galileans, and not in the politer and more harmonious ſtrains of Grecian eloquence? I repeat it, the anſwer to both queſtions is the ſame—That it might appear beyond contradiction, that the excellency of the power was of God and not of man.‡

§ 11. THERE are ſome collateral purpoſes which Providence has effected by the ſame means. One is, that the writings of the New Teſtament carry, in the very expreſſion and idiom, an intrinſic and irreſiſtible evidence of their authenticity. They are ſuch as, in reſpect of ſtyle, could not have been written but by Jews, and hardly even by Jews ſuperior in rank and education to thoſe whoſe names they bear. And what greatly ſtrengthens the argument is, that under this homely garb we find the moſt exalted ſentiments, the cloſeſt reaſoning, the pureſt morality, and the ſublimeſt doctrine. The homelineſs of the diction, when criticiſed by the rules of grammarians and rhetoricians, is what all the moſt learned and judicious of the Greek fathers frankly owned. And is it modeſt in us petty critics of modern times to pretend to be nicer judges of purity and elegance in the Greek language, than Origen and Chryſoſtom, whoſe native tongue it was; and who, beſides, were maſters of uncommon ſkill, as well as fluency, in that language? I have heard of a French critic who undertook to demonſtrate that Ariſtotle did not underſtand Greek, nor Livy Latin. There is hardly an opinion ſo paradoxical or abſurd as not to find ſome admirers. What wonder then that we ſhould meet with people who eſteem a Pſochinius and a Blackwall § better judges of Greek than the greateſt orators among the Grecians, and maintain that Paul's ſtyle, in ſpite of his own verdict, is as claſſical as Plato's. The writings of the ancient Greeks have been rummaged for the diſcovery of words and phraſes, which, in the import given them, might appear to reſemble what has been accounted Hebraiſm or Syriaſm in the New Teſtament. The ſucceſs of ſuch endeavours has been far from giving ſatisfaction to readers of diſcernment. It will readily be acknowledged by the impartial, that ſeveral idioms in the New Teſtament have been miſtaken for Oriental, which may be as truly denominated Grecian. But there remains a much larger number of thoſe brought under that claſs, concerning which there can be no reaſonable doubt. ‖

§ 12. THE

* 1 Cor. i. 17. † 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

‡ Thoſe who deſire to ſee this argument treated as it affects infidels (who make a handle of the badneſs of the ſtyle to diſcredit revelation, may conſult the late Biſhop of Glouceſter's Doctrine of Grace, B. I. ch. viii, ix. & x. I here conſider the queſtion chiefly as affecting ſome well-meaning but miſtaken Chriſtians. It may be proper further to obſerve, that the opinion of the very acute and learned author of the work above mentioned, does not, on the ſubject of inſpiration laid down in ch. vii, in every thing coincide with that here ſupported. A diſtinction is made by him, not only between the ſtyle and the ſentiments, but between the ſentiments of greater and thoſe of leſs moment, in the ſeveral books. The latter diſtinction leads to a controverſy which is quite foreign from my argument, and with which for that reaſon I have not meddled.

§ A Blackwall, author of "The Sacred Claſſics defended and illuſtrated."

‖ The very firſt words of the Goſpel, Βιβλος γενεσεως, for *genealogy* or *lineage*, are one example amongſt hundreds that might be produced. How many meanings are given to the word σαρξ, *fleſh*, in that ſacred volume, for which you will not find a ſingle authority in any prophane writer? Beſide the original meaning of the word univerſally admitted, it denotes ſometimes the whole body conſidered as animated, as in Matth. xxvi. 41. *The ſpirit is willing, but the* fleſh *is weak*.—This may indeed be thought to be of all the deviations from the proper ſenſe, the moſt defenſible on claſſical and rhetorical principles, being not an unnatural ſy-

§ 12. THE methods by which our opponents on this article ſupport their hypotheſis are, I ſay, unſatisfactory. There are ſuch negligencies in the ſtyle even of the beſt writers, as to render it unſafe to pronounce on the goodneſs of an expreſſion which we have only once met with, though in a celebrated author. Much leſs ought a ſingular phraſe found in one ſingle claſſic, ſimilar to an idiom frequent in the New Teſtament, to be accounted evidence, that the idiom was in general and approved uſe, which always determines purity in every tongue. The ſingularity in the one caſe, oppoſed to the frequency in the other other, ſhould lead us to a very different concluſion. The evidence cannot be more ſatisfactory which ariſes from a particular turn of expreſſion occurring in ſome poetical work, and coinciding with an idiom current in the New Teſtament, which is written in proſe. We know, that the Greek poetry had a peculiar dialect, and many peculiar words; and that their poets were, by the laws of their verſification, allowed a latitude in this reſpect, with which their proſe writers were not indulged: nor is there any thing that their critics more loudly condemn, as favouring of artifice and affectation, than what may be called a poetic phraſeology in proſe. Let it not be imagined that I think the ſacred penmen chargeable with any thing affected or artificial in their phraſeology. There is no character of ſtyle for which they are more diſtinguiſhable than the reverſe. But what would be juſtly denominated artificial, affected, and foreign in a native of Attica, might be the reſult of the moſt undeſigning and natural ſimplicity in an inhabitant of Paleſtine, becauſe conformable to the idioms of his native language. Further, a ſtrong reſemblance, in an expreſſion admitted to be claſſical, will not ſuffice for removing the charge of foreign idiom from the reſembling but different expreſſion. In moſt caſes, nothing leſs than identity will ſerve. * Recourſe to ſynonymas, analogy, and etymology, is neceſſary and often ſucceſsful in diſcovering the ſenſe of an obſcure expreſſion, whereof nothing leſs than the uſe of good authors will warrant the propriety or elegance. Sufficient evidence in the one caſe, is often no evidence in the other.

§ 13. BLACKWALL† admits freely that there are many Hebraiſms in the New Teſtament, at the ſame time aſſerting that they are real beauties, which add both vigour and ornament to the expreſſion. In this opinion, if he was ſerious, I believe that, upon examination, we ſhall not be found to differ. Abſtracting from

negdoché of the part for the whole.—Secondly, It ſometimes means a human being, as in Luke, iii, 6. *All* fleſh *ſhall ſee the ſalvation of God*; ſometimes, 3dly, a perſon's kindred collectively conſidered, as in Rom. xi. 14. *If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my* fleſh;—ſometimes, 4thly, any thing of an external or ceremonial nature, as oppoſed to that which is internal and moral, as in Gal. iii. 3. *Having begun in the ſpirit, are ye now made perfect by the* fleſh?—ſometimes, 5thly, the ſenſitive part of our nature, the ſeat of appetite, as in 2 Cor. vii. 1. *Let us cleanſe ourſelves from all filthineſs of the* fleſh *and ſpirit*, where there can be no doubt that the pollutions of the fleſh muſt be thoſe of the appetites, being oppoſed to the pollutions of the ſpirit or thoſe of the paſſions. 6thly, and laſtly, It is employed to denote any principle of vice and moral pravity of whatever kind. Thus among *the works of the fleſh* (Gal. v. 19, 20, 21) are numbered not only *adultery, fornication, uncleanneſs, laſciviouſneſs, drunkenneſs*, and *revellings*, which all relate to criminal indulgences of appetite, but *idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, ſtrife, ſeditions, hereſies, envyings*, and *murders*, which are manifeſtly vices of a different kind, and hold more of the diabolical nature than of the beaſtly.—Now, for any of the ſix meanings above mentioned, except perhaps the firſt, as to which I will not be poſitive, we may defy thoſe critics to produce claſſical authority. Yet no man accuſtomed to the oriental idiom, and the ſtyle of the ſacred writers, can miſtake the ſenſe in any of the paſſages quoted.

* I ſhall illuſtrate this by an example in regard to which every Engliſh reader can with ſafety be more deciſive than even men of literature are qualified to be in regard to an example taken from a dead language. In a letter during the late war from the captain of a French privateer to the magiſtrates of a ſeaport, demanding a contribution, and threatening in caſe of non-compliance to deſtroy the town, there was this expreſſion, "I will *make* my duty." No Engliſhman, we are certain, would have expreſſed himſelf ſo, unleſs he had done it for a diſguiſe. Yet I can eaſily conceive that a foreigner, who has learnt our language only by book, might ſpeciouſly maintain, that the expreſſion, ſo far from being a Galliciſm, is unexceptionable Engliſh. "Is it not," he would argue, "common to ſay, I will do my duty? Now, if this expreſſion be claſſical, where is the impropriety in ſubſtituting one ſynonymous word for another?" And to ſhow that *do* and *make* are ſynonymous, he might urge, firſt, that in moſt other tongues one word ſerves for both. Thus each of them is rendered into Latin, *facere*; into Italian, *fare*; into French, *faire*. Secondly, though he had not found in any Engliſh book the identical phraſe, to *make duty*, he could produce expreſſions in which there is an entire ſimilarity. *To make court, to make obeiſance*, are both good; nay, it ſtrengthens the argument, that *to do obeiſance*, is alſo uſed in the ſame ſignification. Shakeſpear ſays, "What *make* they there?" which is equivalent to, What do they there? Dryden ſpeaks of "the faults he had made; though doubtleſs the more uſual expreſſion would have been "the faults he had done." Now, from the firſt principles of analogy, we are warranted to conclude, that if *making a fault* be proper to expreſs *doing wrong, making a duty*, is proper to expreſs *doing right*. All this is very plauſible, and would probably be ſufficient to convince moſt ſtrangers, but would only extort a ſmile from an intelligent native, on whom a thouſand ſuch arguments could make no impreſſion. Yet I will venture to affirm that, if there be no ſolidity in this reaſoning, nine tenths of what has been ſo pompouſly produced to ſhow that the ſuppoſed Hebraiſms of the New Teſtament are in the genuine idiom of the Greek tongue, are no better than arrant trifling. It was to triflers of this ſort that Chryſoſtom ſaid very appoſitely, ἵνα μὴ καταγελώμεθα ὅτω διαλεγόμενοι πρὸς Ἕλληνας, ἐπειδὰν ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτὰς ἀγωνίζηται, καταγορώμεν αὐτοῦ σολῶν ὡς ἀμαθῆ· ἡ γὰρ κατηγορία αὕτη ἐγκώμιον. Chryſ. Hom. 3. in 1 Cor. i. "That we may not render ourſelves ridiculous, arguing thus with Grecians, for our diſpute is with them; let us accuſe the Apoſtles of being illiterate, for this accuſation is an encomium." Origen goes ſtill farther, and ſays, Οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι τυγχάνοντες τῶν ἐν τοῖς προσώποις, φασὶν ἰδιῶται εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει. Philoc c. 4. "The Apoſtles, not inſenſible of their own defects, profeſs themſelves to be of the vulgar in ſpeech, but not in knowledge."

† Sacr. Claſſ. Part I. Ch. 1.

from that loweſt kind of beauty in language, which reſults from its ſoftneſs and harmony, conſidered as an object to the ear, every excellency of ſtyle is relative, ariſing ſolely from its fitneſs for producing, in the mind of the reader, the end intended by the writer. Now in this view it is evident, that a ſtyle and manner may, to readers of one denomination, convey the writer's ſentiments with energy as well as perſpicuity, which, to thoſe of a different denomination, would convey them feebly, darkly, and, when judged by their rules of propriety, improperly. This I take to have been actually the caſe with the writers of the New Teſtament. I ſpeak particularly of the hiſtorical books. I look upon the language of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as better adapted to the readers for whoſe uſe the Goſpels and Acts were at firſt compoſed, than the language of Plato or Demoſthenes would have been.

I ſhould at the ſame time think it unreaſonable to deny that the latter muſt have been more intelligible to an Athenian, and much more pleaſing, nervous, and animated than the former. Nay, if ſuch a one had even denominated the idiom of the New Teſtament *barbarous*, I ſhould not have thought it an unpardonable offence. The word indeed ſounds harſhly; but we know that from the mouths of native Greeks it could only mean that the idiom of that book is not conformable to the rules of their grammarians and rhetoricians, and to the practice of their writers of reputation; a conceſſion which we may eaſily make them, without derogating in the leaſt from the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts—a conceſſion which (as was obſerved before) the moſt learned and oratorical of the Greek fathers did not ſcruple to make. In ſuch caſes it is evident, that a native of common ſenſe is a much better judge than a learned foreigner*."

§ 14. I EXPRESSED myſelf dubiouſly of Blakwall's ſerioufneſs in affirming that the Oriental idioms, with which the ſacred authors abound, are highly ornamental to their compoſitions; becauſe nothing can be plainer than that he is indefatigable in controverting their claims to the greater part of thoſe ornaments. I cannot think he would have willingly injured them; yet it is impoſſible not to perceive, that he is at infinite pains, though on the moſt frivolous pretexts †, to diveſt them of almoſt every beauty of this ſort aſcribed to them by others! I deſire only to reſtore to them the merit, of which he has not very conſiſtently, though I believe with a pious intention, endeavoured to ſtrip them. This critic did not conſider, that when he admitted any Hebraiſms in the New Teſtament, he in effect gave up the cauſe. That only can be called a Hebraiſm in a Greek book, which, though agreeable to the Hebrew idiom, is not ſo to the Greek. Nobody would ever call that a Scotticiſm which is equally in the manner of both Scots and Engliſh. Now, ſuch foreign idioms as Hebraiſms in Greek, Greciſms in Hebrew, or Latiniſms in either, come all within the definition of barbariſm, and ſometimes even of ſoleciſm—words which have always ſomething relative in their ſignification; that turn of expreſſion being a barbariſm or a ſoleciſm in one language, which is ſtrictly proper in another—and I may add, to one ſet of hearers which is not ſo to another. It is then in vain for any one to debate about the application of of the names *barbariſm* and *ſoleciſm*.

To do ſo is at beſt but to wrangle about words, after admitting all that is meant by them. The Apoſtle Paul, leſs ſcrupulous, does not heſitate, by implication, to call every tongue barbarous to thoſe who do not underſtand it. *If I know not the meaning of the voice, I ſhall be a barbarian to him that ſpeaketh; and he that ſpeaketh ſhall be a barbarian to me* ‡. Nor does it make any difference, as appears from the whole of the Apoſtle's argument, even if what is ſpoken be ſpoken by the Spirit. Surely, with equal reaſon, we may ſay of thoſe foreign idioms in any tongue, which render what is ſaid unintelligible or even obſcure to the natives, that in reſpect of them they are barbariſms. Nor is it, I think, denied by any judicious perſon, that there are ſome idiomatical expreſſions in the New Teſtament which muſt have puzzled thoſe who were abſolute ſtrangers to the language of Holy Writ §. My

* Hardly any foreigner of this century has been more converſant with Engliſh men and Engliſh books than *Voltaire*. Yet his knowledge of our language, on which I have been told he piqued himſelf not a little, has not ſecured him from blundering when he attempted to write it. In a letter to the Pariſians, prefixed to his comedy *L'Eccoſſaiſe*, which he thought proper to introduce to the world as a tranſlation, he quotes the following ſentence as part of a letter he had received from the Engliſh author: "You "have quite empoveriſhed the character of Waſp; and you have blotted his chaſtiſement at the end of the drama." An Engliſhman might have gueſſed what he meant by the firſt clauſe, but muſt have remained in total darkneſs about the ſecond, if he had not explained himſelf by ſubjoining the tranſlation. *Vous avez afaibli le caractére de Frelon; et vous avez ſupprimé ſon châtiment a la fin de la piéce.* An explanation not leſs neceſſary to many of his Engliſh readers than to his French.

† The following is a ſpecimen, Vol. II. Part. I Ch. 2. § 2. "Καταβολη κοσμου in the ſacred writers, ſeemed to ſome gentle-"men converſant in theſe ſtudies unexampled in the old Grecians. Indeed it is very rare; but it is found in the lofty Pindar "(Nem. Od. 2.) Καταβολαν ἐερων αγωνων." A moſt extraordinary way of proving that the phraſe Καταβολη κοσμου is not unexampled in the old Grecians. About the noun Καταβολη no doubt was ever made, nor was any doubt made about Κοσμος; the queſtion was ſolely about the phraſe.

‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

§ Take the two following for examples: Ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα, Luke, i. 37. and εκ ου εσωθη πασα σαρξ, Matt. xxiv. 22. phraſes which in my apprehenſion would not have been more intelligible to a Greek author than Arabic or Perſian would have been. Ρημα for *thing*, παν εκ and πασα εκ for *no* or *none* σαρξ for *perſon*, &c. would to him, I ſuſpect, have

My intention in obſerving this, is chiefly to ſhow, that if we would enter thoroughly into the idiom ofthe New-Teſtament, we muſt familiariſe ourſelves to that of the Septuagint; and if we would enter thoroughly into the idiom of the Septuagint, we muſt accuſtom ourſelves to the ſtudy, not only of the original of the Old Teſtament, but of the dialect ſpoken in Paleſtine between the return of the Jews from the Babyloniſh captivity and the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by the Romans; for this laſt, as well as the Hebrew, has affected the language both of the old Greek tranſlation and of the New Teſtament. But of this, more afterwards.

§15. SUCH is the origin and the character of the idiom which prevails in the writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and the remarkable conformity of the new revelation we have by them, though written in a different language, to the idiom of the old. It has been diſtinguiſhed in the former by the name Helleniſtic, not with critical accuracy, if regard be had to the derivation of the word, but with ſufficient exactneſs, if attention be given to the application which the Hebrews made of the term Helleniſt, whereby they diſtinguiſhed their Jewiſh brethren, who lived in Grecian cities and ſpoke Greek. It has been by ſome of late, after father Simon of the *Oratory*, more properly termed the Greek of the ſynagogue. It is acknowledged that it cannot ſtrictly be denominated a ſeparate language, or even dialect, when the term dialect is conceived to imply peculiarities in declenſion and conjugation. But with the greateſt juſtice, it is denominated a peculiar idiom, being not only Hebrew and Chaldaic phraſes put in Greek words, but even ſingle Greek words uſed in ſenſes in which they never occur in the writings of prophane authors, and which can be learnt only from the extent of ſignification given to ſome Hebrew or Chaldaic word, correſponding to the Greek in its primitive and moſt ordinary ſenſe. This difference in idiom conſtitutes a difficulty of another kind from that which is created by a difference in dialect; a difficulty much harder to be ſurmounted, as it does not affect the form of the words, but the meaning.

§16. It is pertinent, however, to obſerve that the above remarks on the Greek of the New Teſtament, do not imply that there was any thing which could be called idiomatical or vulgar in the language of our Lord himſelf, who taught always in his mother tongue. His Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, on the contrary, who wrote in Greek, were, in writing, obliged to tranſlate the inſtructions received from him into a foreign language of a very different ſtructure, and for the uſe of people accuſtomed to a peculiar idiom. The apparently reſpectful manner in which our Saviour was accoſted by all ranks of his countrymen, and in which they ſpoke of his teaching, ſhows that he was univerſally conſidered as a perſon of eminent knowledge and abilities. It was the amazing ſucceſs of his diſcourſes to the people, in commanding the attention and reverence of all who heard him, which firſt awaked the jealouſy of the ſcribes and phariſees.

PART II.

The Style and Inſpiration.

WE are not however to imagine, that becauſe all the writers of the New Teſtament wrote in the idiom of the ſynagogue, there is no diſcernible diverſity in their ſtyles. As the ſame language admits a variety of dialects, and even of provincial and foreign idioms, ſo the ſame dialect and the ſame idiom is ſuſceptible of a variety of ſtyles. The ſtyle of Paul has ſomething peculiar, by which, in my opinion, there would be no difficulty in diſtinguiſhing him from any other writer. A diſcerning reader would not readily confound the ſtyle of Luke with that of either of the Evangeliſts who preceded him, Matthew or Mark; and ſtill leſs I imagine would he miſtake the Apoſtle John's diction for that of any other penman of the New Teſtament. The ſame differences of ſtyle will be diſcovered by one who is but

proved inſurmountable obſtacles. Indeed the vulgar tranſlation of the laſt phraſe is no more Latin than the original is claſſical Greek. *Non fierit ſalva omnis caro*, which we may venture to affirm would have been no better than a riddle to Cicero or Cæſar. Caſtalio has expreſſed the ſenſe in proper Latin, *Nemo prorſus evaderet*. Our tranſlators have not unfitly kept in their verſion the one Hebraiſm *fleſh* for perſon, to which our ears are by ſcriptural uſe familiariſed, and not leſs fitly rejected the other ſaying, *No fleſh ſhould be ſaved*; for every body muſt be ſenſible that if they had preſerved alſo the other idiom in Engliſh, and ſaid, *All fleſh ſhould not be ſaved*, the ſenſe would have been totally altered. This is but a ſmall ſpecimen, not the hundredth part of what might be produced on this ſubject.

moderately converſant in Hebrew in the writers of the Old Teſtament. In it we have ſtill greater variety than in the New. Some of the books are written in proſe and ſome in verſe; and in each the differences between one book and other are conſiderable. In the Book of Job, for inſtance, the character of the ſtyle is remarkably peculiar. What can be more diſſimilar in this reſpect, though both are excellent in their kind, than the towering flights of the ſublime Iſaiah, and the plaintive ſtrains of the pathetic Jeremiah? In the books of Scripture we can ſpecify the conciſe ſtyle and the copious, the elevated and the ſimple, the aphoriſtic and the diffuſe.

The difference, I own, is not ſo remarkable in tranſlations as in the original. The reaſon will be evident on a little reflection. Every man, and every tranſlator, has his peculiar diction and manner, which will rarely fail to affect, not only his own compoſitions, but alſo the verſions he makes from other authors. In every verſion of the Bible, therefore, wherein the different books have the ſame tranſlator, there will be more or leſs of an aſſimilating quality, by which the works tranſlated are brought in point of expreſſion to bear ſome reſemblance to the ordinary ſtyle of the tranſlator. Now, by being all brought nearer the ſame thing, they are brought nearer one another. Tranſlation, therefore, is a ſort of leveller. By its means, generally, not always (for ſome can adapt themſelves to different ſtyles more eaſily than others), the lofty is depreſſed, the humble elevated, the looſer ſtrains are confined, and the laconic rendered more explicit. The learned reader will be ſenſible of the juſtneſs of this remark, when he reflects how much more diſtinguiſhable the ſtyles of the ſacred penmen above mentioned are in their own language, than even in the beſt tranſlations extant. Add to this, that if, of any two ſacred authors who differ greatly in their ſtyle, we compare together ſome paſſages, as they are rendered in the ſame tranſlation, we ſhall commonly find the ſameneſs of the tranſlator's ſtyle more remarkable in them all, than the differences there may be of the ſtyles of the authors. We ſhall be oftener at a loſs to diſcover in the quotations (if the recollection of the ſentiments do not aſſiſt us) Iſaiah and Amos, Matthew and John, than to recogniſe Caſtalio and Beza, the Vulgate and Junius. Every tranſlator, however, is not equally chargeable with this fault. I think none indeed ſo much as Caſtalio.

§ 2. BUT it may be aſked, How is this diverſity in the diction of the ſacred penmen reconcilable with the idea of inſpiration? Is not the ſtyle of all inſpired writers the ſame, as being the ſtyle of the ſame Spirit by which they were alike directed? That in ſome ſenſe the ſtyle of all thoſe writers is the ſtyle of the Holy Spirit, who ſpoke by them, and was the ſame in them all, is not to be denied; but that the Holy Spirit ſhould always employ the ſame ſtyle in conveying celeſtial truths to men, is no more neceſſary than that he ſhould always uſe the ſame language. People do not ſufficiently advert, when they ſpeak on this ſubject, to the difference between the expreſſion and the ſentiment, but ſtrangely confound theſe, as though they were the ſame; yet no two things can be more widely different. The truths implied in the ſentiments, are eſſential, immutable, and have an intrinſic value: the words which compoſe the expreſſion, are in their nature circumſtantial, changeable, and have no other value than what they derive from the arbitrary conventions of men. That the Holy Spirit would guide the minds of the ſacred penmen in ſuch a manner as to prevent their adopting terms unſuitable to his deſign, or which might obſtruct his purpoſe; and that in other reſpects he would accommodate himſelf to their manner and diction, is both reaſonable in itſelf, and rendered unqueſtionable by the works themſelves, which have the like characteriſtic differences of ſtyle that we find in other literary productions.

Can it be accounted more ſtrange that the Holy Spirit ſhould, by the prophet Amos, addreſs us in the ſtyle of a ſhepherd, and by Daniel, in that of a courtier, than that by the one he ſhould ſpeak to us in Hebrew, and by the other in Chaldee? It is as reaſonable to think that the Spirit of God would accommodate himſelf to the phraſeology and diction, as to the tone of voice and pronunciation, of thoſe whom he was pleaſed to enlighten; for it cannot be denied that the pronunciation of one perſon in uttering a prophecy might be more articulate, more audible, and more affecting than that of another—in like manner as one ſtyle has more harmony, elegance, and perſpicuity than another. Caſtalio ſays juſtly, "*Res dictat "Spiritus, verba quidem et linguam loquenti aut ſcribenti "liberam permittit**;" which is to the ſame purpoſe with what Jerome had ſaid more than a thouſand years before—"*Nec putemus in verbis ſcripturarum evange-"lium eſſe, ſed in ſenſu*†." Allow me to add the teſtimony of a late writer of our own—than whom none has done more to make men apprehend the meaning, and reliſh the beauties of the ſacred poeſy: "*Hoc ita "ſacris vatibus tribuimus, ut nihil derogemus Divini "Spiritus afflatui: etſi ſuam interea vim propriæ cujuſ-"que ſcriptoris naturæ atque ingenio concedamus. Neque*

* "The Spirit dictates the things, leaving the words and language free to the ſpeaker or the writer." Defenſio contra Bezam.

† "Let us not imagine that the goſpel conſiſts in the words of ſcripture, but in the ſenſe." Comment. in Epiſt. ad Gal. cap. i.

" *que enim inſtinctu divino ita concitatur vatis animus, ut* " *protinus obruatur hominis indoles: attoluntur et eri-* " *guntur, non extinguuntur aut occultantur naturalis in-* " *genii facultates; et quanquam Moſis, Davidis, et* " *Iſaiæ, ſcripta ſemper ſpirent quiddam tam excelſum* " *tamque cœleſte, ut plane videantur divinitus edita, nihilo* " *tamen minus in iis Moſem, Davidem, et Iſaiam, ſem-* " *per agnoſcimus**."

§ 3. In this there was an eminent diſparity between the prophets of God and thoſe among the Pagans, ſaid to be poſſeſſed of the ſpirit of *Python*, or ſpirit of divination. Theſe are reported to have uttered their predictions in what is called extaſy or trance, that is, whilſt they underwent a temporary ſuſpenſion both of their reaſon and of their ſenſes. Accordingly they are repreſented as mere machines, not acting but acted upon, and paſſive like the flute into which the muſician blows. This is what has been called organic inſpiration. In imitation of one remarkable claſs of theſe the ſorcerers and ſoothſayers among the Jews (who like thoſe of the ſame craft among Pagans, reaped conſiderable profit from abuſing the credulity of the rabble,) had acquired a wonderful mode of ſpeaking in which they did not appear to employ the common organs of ſpeech, and were thence termed ἐγγαστριμυθοι, *ventriloqui*, belly-ſpeakers. It is in alluſion to this practice that Iſaiah denominates them *the wizzards*† that peep and that mutter, whoſe ſpeech ſeemed to riſe out of the ground, and to whiſper out of the duſt‡.

Totally different was the method of the prophets of the true God. The matter, or all that concerned the thoughts, was given them: what concerned the manner, or enunciation, was left to themſelves. The only exception the Rabbis mention is Balaam, whoſe prophecy appeared to them to have been emitted in ſpite of himſelf. But this caſe, if it was as they imagine, which may be juſtly doubted, was extraordinary. In all other caſes the prophets had, when propheſying, the ſame command over their own actions, over their members and organs, as at other times. They might ſpeak or forbear; they might begin and deſiſt when they pleaſed; they might decline the taſk aſſigned them, and diſobey the divine command. No doubt when they acted thus, they ſinned very heniouſly, and were expoſed to the wrath of Heaven. Of the danger of ſuch diſobedience we have two ſignal examples, in the prophet who was ſent to propheſy againſt the altar erected by Jeroboam at Bethel, and in the prophet Jonah.

But that men continued ſtill free agents, and had it in their power to make a very injudicious uſe of the ſpiritual gifts and illuminations which they received from above, is manifeſt from the regulations on this ſubject, eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtle Paul in the church of Corinth. The words wherewith he concludes his directions on this topic are very appoſite to my preſent purpoſe. *The ſpirits of the prophets* §, ſays he, *are ſubject unto the prophets*. Such is the difference between thoſe who are guided by the Spirit of Truth, and thoſe who are under the influence of a ſpirit of error. There is therefore no reaſon to doubt that the ſacred writers were permitted to employ the ſtyle and idiom moſt familiar to them, in delivering the truths with which they were inſpired. So far only they were over-ruled in point of expreſſion by the divine Spirit, that nothing could be introduced tending in any way to obſtruct the intention of the whole. And ſometimes, eſpecially in the prediction of future events, ſuch terms would be ſuggeſted, as would, even beyond the prophet's apprehenſion, conduce to further that end. The great object of divine regard, and ſubject of revelation, is things, not words. And were it poſſible to obtain a tranſlation of ſcripture abſolutely faultleſs, the tranſlation would be in all reſpects as valuable as the original.

§ 4. But is not this doctrine, it may be ſaid, liable to an objection alſo from the gift of tongues conferred on the Apoſtles and others for the promulgation of the goſpel? In the languages with which thoſe primitive miniſters were miraculouſly furniſhed, it may be objected, they could not have any ſtyle of their own, as a ſtyle is purely the effect of habit, and of inſenſible imitation. This objection however is eaſily obviated: Firſt, as they received by inſpiration thoſe tongues only, whereof they had previouſly no knowledge, it is not probable, at leaſt it is not certain, that this gift had any place in the writings of the New Teſtament: that in the moſt of them it had not, is manifeſt. But 2dly, if in ſome it had, the moſt natural ſuppoſition is, firſt, that the knowledge of the tongue, wherewith the Holy Ghoſt inſpired the ſacred writers, muſt have been in them preciſely ſuch a knowledge and ſuch a readineſs in finding words and expreſſions, as is in others the effect of daily practice. This is even a neceſſary conſequence of ſuppoſing that the language itſelf, and not the words of particular ſpeeches (according to Dr. Middleton's notion ‖), was the gift of the Spirit: 2dly, That their acquaintance with the tongue, ſupernaturally communicated, muſt have been ſuch as would ren-

* De Sacra Poeſi Heb. Præl. xvi. † Iſaiah, viii. 19. ‡ Iſaiah xxix. 4. § 1 Cor. xiv. 32.
‖ Eſſay on the Gift of Tongues.

der their teaching in it beſt adapted to the apprehenſions of the people with whom they would be moſt converſant, or ſuch as they would have moſt readily acquired among them in the natural way. Now on this hypotheſis, which appears on many accounts the moſt rational, the influence of habit, of native idiom, and of particular genius and turn of thinking, would be the ſame on the writer's ſtyle as though he had acquired the language in the ordinary way.

As to the hypotheſis of the author above mentioned, it is not more irrational in itſelf, than it is deſtitute of evidence. It is irrational, as it excludes the primary uſe, the converſion of the nations, for which, by the general acknowledgment of Chriſtians in all ages, the gift of tongues was beſtowed on the Apoſtles, and repreſents this extraordinary power, as ſerving merely to aſtoniſh the hearers, the only purpoſe, according to him, for which it ever was exerted. And as to evidence, the great ſupport of his ſyſtem is an argument which has been ſufficiently conſidered already, the defects of the ſtyle of the ſacred writers, when examined by the rules of the rhetoricians, and the example of the orators of Athens. For, becauſe Cicero and the Greek philoſophers were of opinion, that if Jupiter ſpoke Greek, he would ſpeak like Plato, the learned doctor cannot conceive that a ſtyle ſo unlike Plato's as that of the Evangeliſts, can be the language of inſpiration, or be accounted worthy of God. It was not, we find, peculiar to the Greeks, or to the apoſtolic age, to ſet too high a value on the words which man's wiſdom teacheth. Nor was it only in the days of Samuel, that men needed to be taught that the *Lord ſeeth not as man ſeeth* *."

* 1 Sam. xvi. 7.

DISSERTA-

DISSERTATION THE SECOND.

The Cauſes to which the principal Differences in Languages are imputable; the Origin of the Changes produced on the Language and Idiom of the Jews, and the principal Difficulties to be encountered in tranſlating the Sacred Books.

PART I.

The Cauſes of the Differences in Languages.

WHEN we compare one tongue with another, if we enter critically into the genius and powers of each, we ſhall find that neither the only nor the chief difference is that which is moſt obvious, and conſiſts in the ſounds or words employed, the inflexions, the arrangement, and the conſtruction. Theſe may ſoon be learnt from a tolerable grammar, and are to be conſidered as affecting only the form of the language. There are others which more intimately affecting its ſpirit, it requires a nicer diſcernment to diſtinguiſh. Theſe ſerve much more to characteriſe both the language and the people who ſpeak it. Indeed, the knowledge of one of theſe has a great effect in advancing the knowledge of the other. We may ſay with the greateſt juſtice, that as, on the one hand, the real character of a nation will not be thoroughly underſtood by one who is a perfect ſtranger to their tongue; ſo, on the other, the exact import of many of the words and combinations of words made uſe of in the language, will never be perfectly comprehended by one who knows nothing of the character of the people, who is totally unacquainted with their hiſtory, religion, law, polity, arts, manners, and cuſtoms. Whoever, therefore, would be a proficient in either kind, muſt be a ſtudent in both. It is evident, that the particulars enumerated, or whatever regards the religion, the laws, the conſtitution, and the manners of a people, operate powerfully on their ſentiments; and theſe have a principal effect, firſt on the aſſociations of ideas formed in their minds in relation to character and to whatever is an object of abſtract reflection; ſecondly, on the formation of words, and combination of phraſes, by which theſe aſſociations are expreſſed. But this will be better underſtood from what follows.

§ 2. THERE are certain words in every language to which there are other words perfectly correſponding in other languages. There are certain words in every language which but imperfectly correſpond to any of the words of other languages. There are certain words in every language, to which there is nothing in ſome other languages in any degree correſpondent. I ſhall exemplify theſe three claſſes in Greek, Latin, and Engliſh, which will ſufficiently illuſtrate my meaning.

§ 3. IN all languages, the words whereby the obvious productions of nature, and the plaineſt diſtinctions of genera and ſpecies known to the people are ſignified, correſpond reſpectively to one another. Thus to the Greek words ἥλιος, σελήνη, ὄρνις, δένδρον, ἄστος, ἀμπελος, λίθος, the Latin words *ſol*, *luna*, *avis*, *arbor*, *aquila*, *vitis*, *lapis*, and the Engliſh, *ſun*, *moon*, *bird*, *tree*, *eagle*, *vine*, *ſtone*, are perfectly equivalent in ſignification; and we are ſure that we can never miſtake in rendering the Greek word ἥλιος, wherever it occurs, into Latin by the word *ſol*, and into Engliſh by the word *ſun*. The ſame thing holds true of the other terms in the three languages, taken ſeverally in the order in which I have placed them.

To this claſs we muſt add the names of natural and obvious relations, as πατηρ, μητηρ, υιος, θυγατηρ, ἀδελφος, ἀδελφη, to which the Latin words, *pater*, *mater*, *filius*, *filia*, *frater*, *ſoror*, and the Engliſh words *father*, *mother*, *ſon*, *daughter*, *brother*, *ſiſter*, perfectly correſpond.

To the ſame claſs we ought to aſſign thoſe words whereby the moſt common and neceſſary productions of the mechanic arts are expreſſed: for though, in different countries, and diſtant ages, there are conſiderable differences in the faſhion and appearance of their productions, we attend ſolely, in tranſlating, to the principal uſes which a piece of work was intended to anſwer. Conſequently, when in theſe we find an entire coincidence, we, without further examination, pronounce the names equivalent. Thus οἶκος ναυς, κλινη, in Greek, and *domus*, *navis*, *lectus*, in Latin, anſwer ſufficiently to *houſe*, *ſhip*, *bed*, in Engliſh, on account of the coincidence in uſe of the things ſignified, notwithſtanding the leſs important differences in ſtructure and workmanſhip.

Theſe, however, are not entirely on the ſame footing,

ing with natural objects, in which there is every where, and in every age, a more perfect uniformity. The names βιβλιον, *liber*, *book*, are in most cases suited to one another. But as the books of the ancients were in outward form and construction very different from ours, when we find any thing concerning βιβλιον in Greek, or *liber* in Latin, with an evident allusion to the outward make, we know that the English word *book* is not a proper version. Thus the words ουρανος απεχωρισθη ὡς βιβλιον ειλισσομενον*, if rendered, "heaven "departed as a book that is rolled up," would not be intelligible, though nothing conveys a more distinct image than the words in the original. Their books consisted of long scrolls, commonly of parchment, sewed or pasted together, and fastened at the ends to two rollers. Our translators properly therefore employed here the more general word *scroll*, which perfectly conveys the meaning. Again, the word βιβλιον, occurs in an application wherein the term *book* could not be rightly apprehended by a mere English reader: Βιβλιον γεγραμμενον εσωθεν και οπισθεν †, in the common version, *a book written within and on the backside*. To such a reader, the last term thus applied would be understood to mean the cover, which is not very fit for being written on, and could, besides, contain no more than might have been contained in one additional leaf, though the book had consisted of a thousand leaves. Now the long scrolls or books of the ancients were seldom written but on one side, here said to be εσωθεν, *within*, because that side was turned inwards in rolling. When any of these scrolls was written on both sides, it contained twice as much as if written in the usual way ‡. The chief intention of the Prophet in mentioning this circumstance, must have been to signify that this volume was replete with information, and that its contents were not to be measured by its size. But notwithstanding the exceptions in a few particular cases, the names of the common productions of the most necessary arts, may be considered as so far at least corresponding to each other in most languages, as not to throw any difficulty worth mentioning in the way of a translator.

§ 4. The second class above mentioned, is of those words which in one language do but imperfectly correspond to any of the words of another language compared with it. Of this kind will be found, if properly attended to, most of the terms relating to morals, to the passions and matters of sentiment, or to the objects of the reflex and internal senses, in regard to which it is often impossible to find words in one language that are exactly equivalent to those of another. This holds in all languages less or more, according as there is more or less uniformity in the constitution, religion, and laws, of the nations whose languages are compared; on which constitution, religion, and laws, as was observed, the sentiments, manners, and customs of the people in a great measure depend. Herein consists one principal difficulty, which translators, if persons of penetration, have to encounter. Finding it sometimes impossible to render fully the sense of their author, they are constrained (if I may borrow a term from the mathematicians) to do the best they can by approximation.

To come to examples: To the Greek words αρετη, σωφροσυνη, εγκρατεια, φρονησις, ελεος, the Latin words, *virtus*, *temperantia*, *continentia*, *prudentia*, *misericordia*, are not entirely equivalent; still less the English words *virtue*, *temperance*, *continence*, *prudence*, *mercy*: for though these last are manifestly formed from the Latin words, one would think, that by being adopted into another country, they had all more or less changed their nature with the climate. Those persons whose knowledge in such matters is but superficial, will not enter readily into these sentiments. They are accustomed to consider certain words in the different languages as respectively correspondent. The grammars, lexicons, and common translations, lead them to conclude so, and they enquire no further. But those who are conversant with authors of reputation in these different tongues, will need no arguments to convince them of the truth of what has been advanced.

Who knows not the Latin word *virtus* would, in many instances, be but weakly, not to say improperly, rendered by the English word *virtue*; as that word in Roman authors comes often nearer the import of what we call *valour* or fortitude, sometimes even *brute force*? We should not readily ascribe *virtue* to wild beasts; yet Tacitus so applies the term *virtus*: "*Fera animalia*, "*si clausa teneas, virtutis obliviscuntur.*" And if some of our words have too great latitude of signification to answer always to their Latin etymons; some have, on the contrary too little. For example, the English *temperance* is too confined in meaning to answer to the Latin *temperantia*, which implies moderation in every desire, and is defined by Cicero in one place, "*modera-*"*tio cupiditatum rationi obediens* §;" and in another. "*temperantia est quæ in rebus aut expetendis aut fugiendis,* "*rationem ut sequamur, monet* ‖." Now all that is implied in the English word is almost only that species which he denominates "*temperantia in victu.*" And though the differences may not be so considerable in all

* Rev. vi. 14. † Rev. v. i.

‡ A book executed in this manner the Greeks called οπισθογραφον, which is thus expressed by Juvenal, "*Scripsi et in tergo.*" Sat. 1.

§ De Fin. l. ii. ‖ De Fin. l. i.

all the other related words above mentioned, it were eaſy to ſhew that they cannot in every inſtance be made to tally.

It requires indeed but a very ſmall ſkill in languages to enable us to diſcover that etymology is often a very unſafe guide to the proper acceptation of a term. It will not be doubted that the Latin word *ſobrius* is the root of the Engliſh word *ſober*, and their term *honeſtum* of our term *honeſty*; but every body knows that the related words in the two languages will not always anſwer to each other. Nay, to ſhew in the ſtrongeſt manner how much more difficult it is than is commonly imagined, to apprehend the preciſe import and proper application of words of this order in dead languages, I ſhall tranſcribe a ſhort paſſage from the fourth book of the Tuſculan Queſtions, where the author explains the generic word *ægritudo*, with the various names of ſpecies comprehended under it. Amongſt other obſervations are the following: "*Ægritudo eſt opinio recens mali preſentis, in quo demitti contrahique animo rectum eſſe videatur. Ægritudini ſubjiciuntur angor, mœror, dolor, luctus, ærumna, afflictatio: angor eſt ægritudo premens, mœror ægritudo flebilis, ærumna ægritudo laborioſa, dolor ægritudo crucians, afflictatio ægritudo cum vexatione corporis, luctus ægritudo ex ejus qui carus fuerat, interitu acerbo.*" "Let any one," ſays d'Alembert *, "examine this paſſage with attention, and ſay honeſtly, whether, if he had not known of it, he would have had any idea of theſe nice ſhades of ſignification here marked; and whether he would not have been much embarraſſed, had he been writing a dictionary, to diſtinguiſh with accuracy the words *ægritudo, mœror, dolor, angor, luctus, ærumna, afflictatio.* If Cicero, the greateſt philoſopher as well as orator that ever Rome produced, had compoſed a book of Latin ſynonymas, ſuch as that which Abbé Girard did of French; and if this work had but now for the firſt time been produced in a circle of modern Latiniſts, I imagine it would have greatly confounded them, in ſhewing them how defective their knowledge is of a ſubject of which they thought themſelves maſters."

I have brought this quotation, not to ſupport D'Alembert's opinion, who maintains that it is impoſſible for any modern to write Latin with purity; but only to ſhew how much nicer a matter it is than is commonly ſuppoſed, to enter critically into the peculiarities of a dead language. It might be eaſily ſhown, were it neceſſary, that diſtinctions like thoſe now illuſtrated in the nouns, obtain alſo in the verbs of different languages. Under this claſs thoſe words alſo may be comprehended which are not barely the names of certain things, or ſigns of particular ideas, but which expreſs alſo the affection or diſpoſition of the ſpeaker towards the thing ſignified. In every language we ſhall find inſtances wherein the ſame thing has different names, which are not perfectly ſynonymous; for though there be an identity of ſubject there is a difference of manner wherein the ſpeaker appears affected towards it. One term will convey the idea with contempt, another with abhorrence, a third with ſome reliſh, a fourth with affection, and a fifth with indifference. Of this kind are the diminutives and amplificatives which abound ſo much in the Greek and Italian languages.

It is this principally which juſtifies Girard's obſervation, that there are much fewer words in any language which are in all reſpects ſynonymous than is commonly imagined. And it is this which makes the ſelection of appoſite words ſo much and ſo juſtly the ſtudy of an orator: for when he would operate on the paſſions of his hearers, it is of the laſt conſequence, that the terms he employs not only convey the idea of the thing ſignified, which may be called the primary uſe; but that along with it, they inſinuate into the minds of the hearers, the paſſion of the ſpeaker, whatever it be, love or hatred, admiration or contempt, averſion or deſire. This, though the ſecondary uſe of the word, is not the leaſt eſſential to his deſign. It is chiefly from the aſſociated affection that theſe different qualities of ſynonymous words taken notice of by Quintilian muſt be conſidered as originating: "*Sed cum idem frequentiſſime plura ſignificent, quod συνωνυμα vocatur, jam ſunt alia aliis honeſtiora, ſublimiora, nitidiora, jucundiora, vocaliora.*" The laſt is the only epithet which regards merely the ſound. The following will ſerve for an example of ſuch Engliſh ſynonymas, *public ſpeaker, orator, declaimer, haranguer, bolder-forth.* The ſubject of them all is the ſame, being what the firſt expreſſion, *public ſpeaker*, ſimply denotes; the ſecond expreſſes alſo admiration in the perſon who uſes it; the third conveys diſapprobation, by hinting that it is the ſpeaker's object rather to excite the paſſions, than to convince the judgment; the fourth is diſreſpectful, and the fifth contemptuous.

But there is a difference in words called ſynonymous, ariſing from the cuſtomary application, even when they imply little or nothing of either ſentiment or affection. The three words, *death, deceaſe, demiſe*, all denote the ſame thing. The firſt is the ſimple and familiar term; the ſecond is formal, being much employed in proceedings at law; the third is ceremonious, and ſcarcely uſed of any but princes and grandees. There are alſo ſome words peculiar to poetry, ſome to burleſque, which it is needleſs here to ſpecify. From theſe obſervations we learn, that in writings where words of this ſecond claſs frequently occur, it is impoſſible, in a conſiſtency with either perſpicuity or propriety, to tranſlate them uniformly by the ſame terms, like thoſe of the firſt. For, as has been

* Sur l'Harmonie des Langues, et ſur la Latinité des Modernes.

been obſerved, they are ſuch as do not perfectly correſpond with the terms of a different tongue. You may find a word that anſwers exactly to the word in queſtion in one acceptation, that will not ſuit it in another; though for this purpoſe ſome other term may be found equally well adapted.

It was too ſervile an attempt in the firſt tranſlators of the Old Teſtament (at leaſt of the Pentateuch, for the whole does not appear to have been tranſlated at one time, or by the ſame perſons), at this rigid uniformity in rendering the ſame Hebrew words by the ſame Greek words, which has given ſuch a peculiarity of idiom to the ſtyle of the Septuagint, and which, iſſuing thence as from its fountain, has infected more or leſs all the writings of the New Teſtament. I might obſerve further, that there are ſome words in the original by no means ſynonymous, which have been almoſt uniformly rendered by the ſame term, partly perhaps through not adverting ſufficiently to ſome of the nicer differences of ſignification, partly through a deſire of avoiding, as much as poſſible, in the tranſlation, whatever might look like comment or paraphraſe. Of this I ſhall have occaſion to take notice afterwards.

§ 5. The third claſs above mentioned is of thoſe words in the language of every nation which are not capable of being tranſlated into that of any people, who have not perfect conformity with them in thoſe cuſtoms which have given riſe to thoſe words. Such are the names of weights, meaſures, and coins, which are for the moſt part different in different countries. There is no way that a tranſlator can properly take in ſuch caſes, but to retain the original term, and give the explanation in the margin. This is the way which has actually been taken, perhaps in all the tranſlations of the Old Teſtament. To ſubſtitute for the original term a definition or circumlocution if the word frequently occur, would encumber the ſtyle with an offenſive multiplicity of words, and awkward repetitions, and thereby deſtroy at once its ſimplicity, vivacity, and even perſpicuity. In this claſs we muſt alſo rank the names of the particular rites, garments, modes, exerciſes, or diverſions, to which there is nothing ſimilar among thoſe into whoſe language the verſion is to be made. Of this claſs there are ſeveral words retained in the common Engliſh tranſlation; ſome of which, by reaſon of their frequency, have been long ſince naturalized amongſt us; as *ſynagogue*, *ſabbath*, *jubilee*, *purim*, *ephod*, *homer*, *ephah*, *ſhekel*, *gerah*, *teraphim*, *urim* and *thummim*, *phylacteries*, *cherubim*, *ſeraphim*, and a few others.

Beſides theſe, often the names of offices, judicatories, ſects, parties, and the like, ſcarcely admit of being transferred into a verſion in any other manner. It muſt be owned, however, that in regard to ſome of theſe, eſpecially offices, it is a matter of greater nicety than is commonly imagined, to determine when the name ought to be rendered in the tranſlation by a term imperfectly correſponding, and when it ought to be retained. What makes the chief difficulty here is, that there are offices in every ſtate and in every conſtitution, which are analogous to thoſe of other ſtates and conſtitutions in many material circumſtances, though they differ in many others. It is not always eaſy to ſay, whether the reſemblances or the peculiarities preponderate. If the former, the word ought to be tranſlated, if the latter, it ought to be retained. The inconveniency of an exceſs in the firſt way is, that it may lead the reader into miſtakes; that of an exceſs in the ſecond is, that it occaſions obſcurity, and by the too frequent interſperſion of uncouth and foreign words, gives the appearance of barbariſm to a verſion.

It may be ſaid however, in general, that the latter is the ſafer error of the two. Not only does the ſpeciality of the caſe afford a ſufficient apology for the uſe of ſuch words; but if either the dignity of the nation, which is the ſubject, or our connexion with the people, or intereſt in their hiſtory, ſhall familiarize us to their inſtitutions and cuſtoms, the barbariſm of the terms will vaniſh of courſe. Who conſiders now theſe names of Roman magiſtracies, *conſul*, *pretor edile*, *cenſor*, *queſtor*, *dictator*, *tribune*, as barbarous? Yet they are not the names of officers amongſt us correſpondent or ſimilar to thoſe among the Romans. To have employed inſtead of them, *mayor*, *alderman*, *ſheriffs*, &c. we ſhould have juſtly thought much more exceptionable. I have heard of a Dutch tranſlator of Cæſar's Commentaries, who always rendered *conſul*, *burgomaſter*, and in the ſame taſte the names of all the other officers and magiſtrates of Rome. A verſion of this kind would appear to us ridiculous.

§ 6. It is almoſt unneceſſary to obſerve, that the two laſt are the only claſſes of words wherein the ſtudent will find any thing that can greatly puzzle him. A mere ſchool-boy, with the help of his grammar and lexicon, may acquire all that is requiſite for the juſt interpretation of the words of the firſt claſs. Thoſe of third, it is manifeſt, are not to be underſtood by us without a previous knowledge of the religious and political conſtitutions of the country, together with their ceremonies and uſuages; and thoſe of the ſecond, which is the matter of the greateſt delicacy of all, cannot be thoroughly apprehended without an acquaintance with the national character, that is, the prevalent caſt of mind, manners and ſentiments of the people. So much is neceſſary in order to be maſter of the language of any country; and of ſo much importance it is, in order clearly to comprehend the ſtyle of Scripture, to be well acquainted with whatever concerns the Jewiſh nation.

PART

PART II.

The Origin of the Changes in the Idiom of the Jews.

IT is true that, as the New Teſtament is written in Greek, it muſt be of conſequence that we be able to enter critically into the ordinary import of the words of that tongue, by being familiarized to the genius and character of thoſe who ſpoke it. But from what has been obſerved it is evident that, though in ſeveral caſes this knowledge may be eminently uſeful, it will not ſuffice; nay, in many caſes, it will be of little or no ſignificancy. Thoſe words, in particular, which have been in moſt familiar uſe with the old interpreters, and have been current in the explanations given in the Helleniſtical ſynagogues and ſchools, have, with their naturalization among the Iſraelites, acquired in the Jewiſh uſe, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, an infuſion of the national ſpirit. Though the words therefore are Greek, Jewiſh erudition is of more ſervice than Grecian, for bringing us to the true acceptation of them in the ſacred writings. Would you know the full imports of the words ἁγιασμος, for example, and δικαιοσυνη in the New Teſtament? It will be in vain to rummage the claſſics. Turn to the pages of the Old Teſtament. It will avail little to recur to the Greek roots ἁγιος and δικη. Examine the extent given to the ſignification of the Hebrew roots קדש *kadaſh*, and צדק *tſadak*, which have given occaſion to the introduction of thoſe Greek terms into the tranſlation of the Seventy.

§ 2. CLASSICAL uſe both in Greek and in Latin is not only, in this ſtudy, ſometimes unavailable, but may even miſlead. The ſacred uſe and the claſſical are often very different. We know the import of the word *ſanctitas* in the Vulgate and in eccleſiaſtical writers, and that it anſwers exactly enough to our own word *ſanctity* derived from it. Yet from Cicero's account, it is plain that, in modern European tongues, we have no word correſponding to it in its primitive and claſſical uſe. "ÆQUITAS," ſays he, "tripartita "dicitur eſſe. Una ad ſuperos deos, altera ad manes, "tertia ad homines pertinere; prima *pietas*, ſecunda "*ſanctitas*, tertia *juſtitia* nominatur*." According to him, therefore, the Latin word *ſanctitas* imports equity or ſuitable regards towards the infernal gods.

But in no inſtances does the claſſical ſenſe of a word differ more from that which it has invariably in the ſacred pages, than in the term ταπεινος, which with the former is always expreſſive of a bad quality, with the latter of a good. With us it is a virtue, with them it was a vice. Nor can it be juſtly affirmed that the word expreſſed the ſame diſpoſition of mind with Pagans, as with Jews and Chriſtians, and that the only difference was in the opinion or judgment formed concerning this diſpoſition; that the former looked upon it with a favourable eye, the latter with an unfavourable. For this is far from being the caſe. The quality of which it is expreſſive in claſſical uſe is totally different from that which it expreſſes in the ſacred writings. In the firſt it correſponded exactly to, and was commonly tranſlated by, the Latin *humilis*, which in profane authors always conveys a bad meaning, and denotes ſuch a feeble, mean, and abject temper, as is the very reverſe of that fortitude, that ſuperiority to death, ſhame and pain, which the law of Chriſt ſo peremptorily exacts and with which the faith of Chriſt ſo powerfully inſpires the genuine diſciple. Ταπεινοτης, the abſtract, is compriſed by Ariſtotle† under μικροψυχια, puſillanimity; or, as explained by lexicographers, "animus demiſſus et abjectus;" and contraſted to μεγαλψυχια magnanimity, "*animi celſitudo*." And to evince that the Latin term, in heathen authors, has the ſame meaning with the Greek, I need no better authority than that of Cicero, who ſays‡, "Succum-"bere doloribus, eoſque *humili* animo imbecilloque "fere miſerum eſt, ob eamque debilitatem animi, "multi parentes, multi amicos, nonulli patriam, "plerique autem ſeipſos penitus perdiderunt." To this he oppoſes, "Robuſtus animus et excelſus, qui "omni eſt liber cura et angore, cum et mortem con-"temnit," &c. The temper of mind here condemned by Cicero every Chriſtian will condemn as much as he; and the application of the term *humilis* to this temper is a demonſtration, that with him the word was the ſign of an idea very different from that of which it has ſince, in conformity to the ſtyle of the Italic tranſlation, been made the ſign by eccleſiaſtical authors.

We may obſerve, by the way, that the Engliſh word *humility*, though borrowed directly from the Latin, conveys not the claſſical, but the ſcriptural ſenſe of the word ταπεινοτης or ταπεινοφροσυνη, which Caſtalio, over-zealous for the Latinity of his ſtyle, never renders *humilitas*, but always *modeſtia*. This word *modeſtia*, however, does not expreſs adequately the ſenſe

* Topica. † Περι αρετων και κακιων. ‡ De Finibus, l. 1.

of the original. *Modeſty* relates only to the opinion of men, *humility* relates alſo and principally, to the unerring judgment of God; and includes ſuch a combination of qualities as no ſpecies of polytheiſm could give a foundation for. It implies, along with a modeſt ſelf-diffidence, a ſenſe of unworthineſs in the ſight of God, accompanied with a profound veneration of his perfections. Accordingly, piety, meekneſs, and modeſty, make, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, the principal figures in the groupe. So far from involving any thing of that weak timidity and irreſolution expreſſed in the paſſage quoted from the philoſopher, as comprehended in the claſſical ſenſe of the term *humilis*; it on the contrary implies, in every ſituation, a ſubmiſſion to the will of Heaven without repining or reſerve, founded in a conſciouſneſs of one's own ignorance of what is beſt upon the whole, and an unſhaken confidence in goodneſs, wiſdom, and power of God, by whoſe providence all events are over-ruled.

This is one of thoſe terms which, in the mouth of a Jew or a Chriſtian, an idolater could not comprehend, till he had previouſly acquired ſome notion of the Biblical theology. To ſome people it may appear ſtrange, that ſo much knowledge ſhould be thought neceſſary for qualifying one to underſtand the words in current uſe in any language. But to thoſe more deeply verſed in theſe matters there will be nothing ſurpriſing in the remark. They will be ſenſible that the modern names, *pedantry*, *foppery*, *gallantry*, *coquetry*, *prudery*, and many others, could not be tranſlated into any language, otherwiſe than by circumlocutions. Monteſquieu * obſerves of what is called *honour* in the monarchies of Europe, that it is unknown, and conſequently unnamed in the deſpotiſms of Aſia, and that it would be even a matter of ſome difficulty to render the term, as underſtoood by Europeans, intelligible to a Perſian.

§ 3. I SHOULD not have been ſo particular on the different acceptations of ſome words uſed by the Jews and by Pagans, but in order to illuſtrate more effectually that important propoſition, that Scripture will ever be found its own beſt interpreter; and to evince what was remarked before, that the manners and ſentiments of a people, being cloſely connected with their conſtitutions and cuſtoms, ſacred and civil, have a powerful influence on the language, eſpecially on thoſe combinations of ideas, which ſerve to denote the various *phaſes* (pardon the the unuſual application of the term) both of virtue and of vice, as diſplayed in the characters of individuals. For though ſome traces of all the virtuous and all the vicious qualities of which human nature is ſuſceptible, will perhaps be found in every country; theſe qualities are greatly diverſified in their appearance, inaſmuch as they invariably receive a kind of ſignature or peculiar modification from the national character. One plain conſequence of this doctrine has been already conſidered, namely, that there will be a diverſity in the aſſociated ideas claſſed under the appellatives, and conſequently in the genius of the languages, wherever there is a diverſity of character in the nations which uſe them.

§ 4. I AM now going to exemplify another conſequence of this doctrine, which is, that the language of the ſame people will vary from itſelf, or, to ſpeak more properly, from what it was in a former period, when the people themſelves undergo a material alteration from what they were, in any of the reſpects above mentioned. Indeed it is manifeſt, that if a nation ſhould continue at the ſame preciſe degree of advancement in the ſciences and arts both elegant and uſeful, ſhould undergo no variation in their form of government, religion, and laws, and ſhould have little or no intercourſe with foreigners, their language and idiom would in all eſſential characters remain the ſame. Theſe two, language and idiom, though often confounded, I have had occaſion to diſcriminate before. The diſtinction deſerves our attention the more, as ſome of the cauſes mentioned operate more upon the one, and others more upon the other; and as one of them may be even totally altered, whilſt the other is retained. This was accordingly the caſe with the Jewiſh nation.

§ 5. DURING the Babyloniſh captivity, the Jews ſcattered through the Aſſyrian provinces loſt irrecoverably, in conſequence of the mixture with ſtrangers ſo much ſuperior to them in number and conſideration, their vernacular dialect. But in conſequence of their attachment to their religion (which included their polity and law); in conſequence of their inviolable regard to their own cuſtoms, and of their deteſtation both of the cuſtoms and of the arts of the heathen; in conſequence of their veneration for the ſacred books, and their never hearing any other than a literal verſion of them in the public offices of religion, they ſtill in a great meaſure preſerved the idiom; inſomuch that if the Chaldee of Jeruſalem was not as different from the Chaldee of Babylon as the Greek of the ſynagogue was from the Greek of the claſſics, the only aſſignable reaſon perhaps is, that the idiom of the Hebrew and that of the Chaldee were originally more akin to each other, than the idiom of the Greek was to either. Now the idiom keeps a much firmer hold of the mind, than the words, which are mere ſounds, do, and which, compared with the other, may be conſidered as but the body, the material part of a language whereof the idiom is the ſoul.

Though the Jewiſh tongue therefore became different

* L'Eſprit des Loix, liv. iii. ca. 8. Lett. Perſ. 88.

rent, their idiom was nearly the ſame. I ſay nearly ſo; hence we infer, that the knowledge of the ſtyle and idiom of the Old Teſtament muſt throw light upon the New: but it was not entirely the ſame. Hence we conclude the utility of knowing the ſtate of the rabbinical and traditionary learning of that people in the days of our Saviour, this being the moſt effectual means of illuſtrating thoſe particulars wherein the idiom of the New Teſtament differs from that of the Old. It was indeed impoſſible that ſuch an intercourſe with ſtrangers as extirpated their language, ſhould not be productive of ſome effect on their notions of things, ſentiments, and manners. And changes produced in the ſentiments and manners of a people never fail to ſhow themſelves in their writings.

§ 6. But if what happened during their captivity had ſome effect on theſe; what followed after their return to Judea had a much greater. The perſecutions they endured under the Grecian empire, on account of their religion, did, as is often the caſe, greatly endear it to them, and make them conſider it in a light, in which (whatever may be ſaid of individuals) they ſeem never as a nation to have conſidered it in before. It became more an object and a ſtudy to them. Senſible how little their perſeverance ſecured to them the temporal advantages held forth in the letter of the law, they became fond of attending to thoſe ſpiritual and ſublime interpretations both of the law and of the prophets, which ſerved to fortify the mind againſt all ſecular loſſes and misfortunes, and inſpire it with hope in the immediate views of torture and of death. Beſides, the intercourſe which from the time of the Macedonian conqueſts they unavoidably had with the Greeks, introduced inſenſibly into their manner of treating religion, an infuſion of the philoſophic ſpirit, with which they had before been utterly unacquainted.

The Greeks were perhaps the moſt inquiſitive, the moſt ingenious, and the moſt diſputatious people that ever appeared upon the earth. The uncommon importance which the Jews attributed to their religious peculiarities both in doctrine and in ceremonies, and their abhorrence of other nations, with whom they would have no intercommunity in worſhip, could not fail to provoke the ſcrutiny and contradiction of a people at once ſo acute and ſo conceited as the Greeks. The Jews alſo in ſelf-defence began to ſcrutinize and argue. On examining and comparing, they perceived in a ſtronger light than ever, the inexpreſſible futility and abſurdity of the mythology of the Greeks, and the noble ſimplicity, purity, and ſublimity of their own theology. The ſpirit of enquiry begot among them, as might have been expected, the ſpirit of dogmatizing, a ſpirit quite unknown to their anceſtors, though many centuries had elapſed from their eſtabliſhment in Canaan to the period of which I am ſpeaking. One of the firſt conſequences of the dogmatical ſpirit was a diviſion into factions and ſects.

In this ſtate we find them in the days of our Lord; the whole nation being ſplit in Phariſees, Sadducees, and Eſſenes. Now of ſuch party diſtinctions there is not a ſingle veſtige in the Old Teſtament. The dogmatiſts on the different ſides would have recourſe to different theories, the theories would give riſe to particular phraſes, by which the peculiar opinions of the partizans would be expreſſed, and even to particular applications of the words and phraſes to which they had been accuſtomed before. Hence the uſefulneſs of underſtanding their differences, and tenets, and manner of expounding ſacred writ.

§ 7. But though the differences in opinions and modes of expoſition which prevailed in the different ſects, do not much affect the ſtyle of the hiſtorical part of the New Teſtament, which in its nature gives leſs occaſion for introducing ſubtleties in ſpeculation, and was written by men who, from their education, cannot be ſuppoſed to have entered much into the polemical diſcuſſions of thoſe days, they may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to affect the ſtyle of the epiſtolary writings, eſpecially of Paul, who was an adept in all the Jewiſh learning of the age. Indeed we learn from Philo, Joſephus, and the talmudical writers, that their literati at that period were become fond of aſſigning a moral ſignificance and purpoſe to all the ritual obſervances of the law, and of applying the words and phraſes relating to theſe in a certain figurative and myſtical manner. That in their mode of application they would often be whimſical, I do not deny; but that the New Teſtament itſelf gives ground to think that their ceremonies and carnal ordinances, as the Apoſtle calls them *, were intended to adumbrate ſome ſpiritual and more important inſtructions, appears to me uncontrovertible.

But whatever be in this, it muſt be allowed to be a matter of ſome moment, that we form a right notion of the different dogmas and prevailing taſte of the time. The reaſon is evident. The ſacred writers, in addreſſing thoſe of their own nation, would doubtleſs, in order to be underſtood, adapt themſelves, as their great Maſter had done before them, to the prevailing idiom and phraſeology. Now this is to be learnt only from the common uſages, and from the reigning modes of thinking and reaſoning, which diſtinguiſhed the people in that age and nation.

* Heb. ix. 10.

The Difficulties found in tranſlating the Scriptures.

IT can ſcarcely admit a doubt, that as every language has in it ſomething peculiar, and as the people of every nation have cuſtoms, rites, and manners wherein they are ſingular; each tongue will have its ſpecial difficulties, which will always be the greater to ſtrangers, the more remote the cuſtoms, rites and manners of the nation are from the cuſtoms, rites, and manners of other nations: for in the ſame proportion the genius of the tongue will differ from that of other tongues. If ſo, it is no wonder that the diſtinguiſhing particularity of the Jews in conſtitution, ſentiments, ceremonies, and laws, ſhould render it more difficult to tranſlate with juſtneſs from their language, than to tranſlate from the language of any people, who, in all reſpects aforementioned, do not ſo remarkably differ from others.

It may be proper here to point out more particularly where difficulties of this kind will be found principally to lie. It is evident that they will not at all affect the conſtruction of the ſentences, or the inflections of the words. The analogy of the language and its whole grammatical ſtructure may be very ſimple and eaſily acquired, whatever be the cuſtoms of the people, or how extraordinary ſoever they may appear to us. Further, ſimple narration is not that kind of writing which will be much affected by thoſe difficulties. The nouns which occur in it are generally of the firſt claſs, mentioned in the preceding part of this Diſſertation. And in theſe, from the principles formerly explained, the interpreter will not often meet with any thing to retard his progreſs. If the narrative be of matters which concern the community at large, as in civil hiſtory, there will no doubt be frequent recourſe to the words of the third claſs. But in regard to theſe, the method of adopting the original term, eſtabliſhed by univerſal practice, and founded in neceſſity, whereby tranſlators extricate themſelves when correſpondent terms cannot be found, does in effect remove the difficulty. And even when words of the ſecond claſs occur, as will ſometimes happen, there is a greater probability that the context will aſcertain their meaning in an hiſtorical work, than there is where they occur in any other kind of writing, ſuch as the didactic, the declamatory, the proverbial or aphoriſtic, and the argumentative.

This is the firſt difficulty proper to be mentioned, ariſing from difference of manners, a difficulty which cannot be ſaid to affect the ſacred writings peculiarly, otherwiſe than in degree. It is always the harder to reach in a verſion the preciſe ſignification of the words of the original, the wider the diſtance is in ſentiments and manners, between the nation in whoſe language the book is written, and the nation into whoſe language it is to be tranſlated.

§ 2. THE ſecond difficulty I ſhall take notice of ariſes from the penury of words in the ancient oriental languages, at leaſt in the Hebrew, a natural conſequence of the ſimplicity of the people, the little proficiency made by them in ſciences and arts, and their early withdrawing themſelves, on account of religion, from the people of other nations. The fewer the words are in any language, the more extenſive commonly is the ſignification given to every word; and the more extenſive the ſignification of a word is, there is the greater riſk of its being miſunderſtood in any particular application; beſides, the fewneſs of words always obliges writers of enlarged minds, for the ſake of ſupplying the deficiency, frequently to recur to metaphor, ſynecdoché, metonomy, catachreſis, and other rhetorical tropes. Theſe accordingly are always found to abound moſt in the ſcantieſt tongues. Now the frequent uſe of tropes occaſions an unavoidable obſcurity and ſometimes ambiguity in the expreſſion.

§ 3. A third difficulty ariſes from the penury of books extant in the genuine ancient Hebrew, there being no more than the books of the Old Teſtament, and not even all theſe. When we conſider the manner in which the knowledge of any language, even of our native tongue, is acquired, we find it is ſolely by attending to the ſeveral ways in which words are uſed in a vaſt variety of occurrences and applications, that the preciſe meaning is aſcertained. As it is principally from converſation in our mother-tongue, or in any living language which we learn from thoſe who ſpeak it, that we have occaſion to obſerve this variety, ſo it is only in books that we have occaſion to obſerve it, when employed in the acquiſition of a dead language. Conſequently the fewer the books are, there is the greater riſk of miſtaking the ſenſe, eſpecially of thoſe words that do not frequently occur. This has given riſe to doubts about the meaning of ſome words, even of the firſt claſs, to wit, the names of a few natural

tural objects, as plants, animals, and precious ſtones, which occur but very rarely in Scripture, and in paſſages where ſufficient light cannot be had from the context.

§ 4. It may indeed be ſaid that, as the writers of the New Teſtament employed not the Hebrew but the Greek language in their compoſitions, neither of the two remarks laſt mentioned can affect them, however they may affect the penmen of the Old. The Greek is indeed a moſt copious language, and the books written in it are very numerous. But whoever would argue in this manner muſt have forgotten, what has been fully evinced in the former Diſſertation, that though the words, the inflection, and the conſtruction in the books of the New Teſtament are Greek, the idiom is ſtrictly Hebraical; or at leaſt he muſt have reflected on the inevitable conſequences of this doctrine, one of which is, that the Hebraiſtic Greek, or Greek of the ſynagogue, as it has been called, will, in a great meaſure, labour under the ſame inconveniences and defects with the tongue on which its idiom is formed. Another conſequence is, that the ſcarcity of books in the language which is the parent of the idiom, is in effect a ſcarcity of the lights that are neceſſary, or at leaſt convenient for the eaſier diſcovery of the peculiarities of the idiomatic tongue formed upon it. The reaſon of both is obvious; it is from that language we muſt learn the import of the phraſes, and even ſometimes of particular words, which otherwiſe would often prove unintelligible.

§ 5. The fourth difficulty which the interpreter of the Bible has to encounter, ariſes from the nature of the prophetic ſtyle, a ſtyle highly figurative, or, as ſome critics have thought proper to denominate it, ſymbolical. The ſymbolic or typical is, in my apprehenſion, very much akin to what may be called the allegoric ſtyle. There is, however, this difference: the ſymbols employed in prophecy have, like the Egyptian hieroglyphs, acquired a cuſtomary interpretation from the eſtabliſhed uſe in that mode of writing, and are ſeldom or never varied; whereas the allegory is more at the diſcretion of the writer. One conſequence of this is, that in the former there is not required the ſame exactneſs of reſemblance between the ſymbols, or the types and their antitypes, as is required in allegory. The reaſon is obvious. The uſual application ſupplies the defects in the firſt; whereas, in the ſecond, it is ſolely by an accuracy of reſemblance that an allegory can be diſtinguiſhed from a riddle.

This difficulty however in the prophetic ſtyle, may be ſaid more ſtrictly to affect the expounder of the ſacred oracles than the tranſlator. For in this mode of writing there are two ſenſes exhibited to the intelligent reader; firſt, the literal, and then the figurative: for, as the words are intended to be the vehicle of the literal ſenſe to the man who underſtands the language, ſo the literal ſenſe is intended to be the vehicle of the figurative to the man whoſe underſtanding is exerciſed "to diſcern the things of the Spirit." It is to ſuch therefore in a particular manner, that whatever is written in the ſymbolic ſtyle in the New Teſtament is addreſſed. Our Lord, to diſtinguiſh ſuch from the unthinking multitude, calls them thoſe who have ears to hear. *Whoſo hath ears to hear*, ſays he, *let him hear* *." The ſame expreſſion is alſo uſed in the Apocalypſe †, a book of prophecies. And it deſerves to be attended to, that Jeſus Chriſt never employs theſe words in the introduction or the concluſion of any plain moral inſtructions, but always after ſome parable or prophetic declarations figuratively expreſſed. Now it is with the literal ſenſe only that the tranſlator, as ſuch, is concerned. For the literal ſenſe ought invariably to be conveyed into the verſion, where, if you diſcover the antitype or myſtical ſenſe, it muſt be, though not through the ſame words, through the ſame emblems, as you do in the original.

This alſo holds in tranſlating allegory, apologue, and parable. A man may render them exactly into another tongue, who has no apprehenſion of the figurative ſenſe. Who can doubt that any fable of Eſop or Phedrus, for example, may be tranſlated with as much juſtneſs by one who has not been told, and does not ſo much as gueſs the moral, as by one who knows it perfectly? Whereas the principal concern of the expounder is to diſcover the figurative import. In the New Teſtament indeed there is only one book, the Apocalypſe, written entirely in the prophetic ſtyle: and it muſt be allowed that that book may be accurately tranſlated by one who has no apprehenſion of the ſpiritual meaning. However, in the greater part both of the hiſtorical and of the epiſtolary writings, there are prophecies interſperſed. Beſides, ſome knowledge in the diction and manner of the prophets is neceſſary for the better apprehenſion of the application made in the New Teſtament, of the prophecies of the Old, and the reaſonings of the Apoſtles in regard to thoſe prophecies.—Indeed it may be affirmed in general, that for tranſlating juſtly what is of a mixed character, where the emblematic is blended with the hiſtorical, ſome knowledge of the myſtic applications is more eſſential, than for tranſlating unmixed prophecy, allegory, or parable.

§ 6. I ſhall mention as the cauſe of a fifth difficulty in the examination, and conſequently in the right interpretation of the Scriptures, that before we begin to ſtudy them critically, we have been accuſtomed to read them in a tranſlation, whence we have acquired a habit of

* Matth. xi. 15. xiii. 9. Mark, iv. 9. Luke, viii. 8.

† Rev. ii. 7. 11. 17. 29.

of conſidering many ancient and oriental terms, as perfectly equivalent to certain words in modern uſe in our own language, by which the other have been commonly rendered. And this habit, without a conſiderable ſhare of knowledge, attention, and diſcernment, is almoſt never perfectly to be ſurmounted. What makes the difficulty ſtill the greater is, that when we begin to become acquainted with other verſions beſide that into our mother-tongue; ſuppoſe Latin, French, Italian; theſe, in many inſtances, inſtead of correcting, ſerve but to confirm the effect. For in theſe tranſlations we find the ſame words in the original, uniformly rendered by words, which we know to correſpond exactly, in the preſent uſe of thoſe tongues, to the terms employed in our own tranſlation.

I hope I ſhall not be ſo far miſunderſtood by any as to be ſuppoſed to inſinuate, by this remark, that people ought to delay reading the Scriptures in a tranſlation, till they be capable of conſulting the original. This would be to debar the greater part of mankind from the uſe of them altogether, and to give up the many immenſe advantages derived from the inſtructions contained in the very worſt verſions of that book, for the ſake of avoiding a few miſtakes, comparatively ſmall, into which one may be drawn even by the beſt. A child muſt not be hindered from uſing his legs in walking, on pretence that if he be allowed to walk, it will be impoſſible always to ſecure him from falling. My intention in remarking this difficulty, is to ſhew firſt that thoſe early ſtudies, however proper and even neceſſary in Chriſtians, are nevertheleſs attended with this inconveniency, that at a time when we are incompetent judges, prepoſſeſſions are inſenſibly formed on mere habit or aſſociation, which afterwards, when the judgment is more mature, cannot eaſily be ſurmounted; 2dly, to account in part, without recurring to obſcurity in the original, for the greater difficulty ſaid to be found in explaining holy writ, than in expounding other works of equal antiquity; and 3dly, to awake a proper circumſpection and caution in every one who would examine the Scriptures with that attention which the ineffable importance of the ſubject merits.

But, in order to ſet the obſervation itſelf in relation to this fifth difficulty in the ſtrongeſt light, it would be neceſſary to trace the origin, and give as it were the hiſtory of ſome terms, which have become technical amongſt eccleſiaſtical writers, pointing out the changes which in a courſe of ages they have inſenſibly undergone. When alterations are produced by ſlow degrees, they always eſcape the notice of the generality of people, and ſometimes even of the more diſcerning. For a term once univerſally underſtood to be equivalent to an original term whoſe place it occupies in the tranſlation, will naturally be ſuppoſed to be ſtill equivalent, by thoſe who do not ſufficiently attend to the variations in the meanings of words, which the tract of time and the alterations in notions and cuſtoms thence ariſing, have imperceptibly introduced. Sometimes etymology too contributes to favour the deception. Is there one of a thouſand among the readers of the original, who entertains the ſmalleſt ſuſpicion that the words, *blaſphemy*, *hereſy*, *myſtery*; *ſchiſm*, do not convey to moderns preciſely the ſame ideas which the Greek words βλασφημια, αιρεσις, μυστηριον, σχισμα, in the New Teſtament, conveyed to Chriſtians in the times of the Apoſtles? Yet that theſe Greek and Engliſh words are far from correſponding perfectly, I ſhall take an occaſion of evincing afterwards *. The ſame thing may be affirmed of ſeveral other words and even phraſes which retain their currency on religious ſubjects, though very much altered in their ſignification.

§ 7. The ſixth and laſt difficulty, and perhaps the greateſt of all, ariſes from this, that our religious ſubjects are commonly formed, not indeed before we read the Scriptures, but before we have examined them. The ordinary conſequence is, that men afterwards do not ſearch the ſacred oracles in order to find out the truth, but in order to find what may authorize their own opinions. Nor is it indeed otherwiſe to be accounted for, that the ſeveral partizans of ſuch an endleſs variety of adverſe ſects (although men who on other ſubjects appear neither weak nor unfair in their reſearches) ſhould all, with ſo much confidence, maintain that the dictates of holy writ are perfectly deciſive in ſupport of their favourite dogmas, and in oppoſition to thoſe of every antagoniſt. Nor is there in the whole hiſtory of mankind a clearer demonſtration than this, of the amazing power of prejudice and prepoſſeſſion.

It may be ſaid, that intereſt often warps men's judgment, and gives them a bias towards that ſide of a queſtion in which they find their account; nay, it may even be urged further, that in caſes in which it has no influence on the head, it may ſeduce the heart, and excite ſtrenuous combatants in defence of a ſyſtem which they themſelves do not believe. I acknowledge that theſe ſuppoſitions are not of things impoſſible. Actual inſtances may be found of both. But for the honour of human nature, I would wiſh to think that thoſe of the ſecond claſs now mentioned, are far from being numerous. But whatever be in this, we certainly have, in caſes wherein intereſt is entirely out of the the queſtion, nay, wherein it appears evidently on the oppoſite ſide, irrefragible proofs of the power of prepoſſeſſion,

* Diſſertation ix.

poſſeſſion, inſomuch that one would almoſt imagine that, in matters of opinion, as in matters of property, a right were conſtituted merely by pre-occupancy. This ſerves alſo to account in part for the great diverſity of ſentiments in regard to the ſenſe of Scripture, without recurring to the common plea of the Romaniſts, its obſcurity and ambiguity.

§ 8. THUS the principal difficulties to be encountered in the ſtudy of Biblical criticiſm are fix, ariſing, 1ſt, from the ſingularity of Jewiſh cuſtoms; 2dly, from the poverty (as appears) of their native language; 3dly, from the fewneſs of the books extant in it; 4thly, from the ſymbolical ſtyle of the prophets; 5thly, from the exceſſive influence which a previous acquaintance with tranſlations may have occaſioned; and, 6thly, from prepoſſeſſions, in what way ſoever acquired, in regard to religious tenets.

DISSERTATION THE THIRD.

Of the Style of the Scripture Hiſtory, particularly the Goſpels.—Its perſpicuity defended againſt the objections of Father Simon.

FROM what has been evinced in the preceding diſcourſe, it will not improbably be concluded that the ſtyle of holy writ, both of the New Teſtament and of the Old of the hiſtorical books as well as of the prophetical and the argumentative, muſt be generally obſcure, and often ambiguous. So much, and with ſo great plauſibility and acuteneſs, has been written by ſome learned men, in proving this point, that were a perſon, before he ever read the Scriptures, either in the original or in a tranſlation, to conſider every topic they have employed, and to obſerve how much, in regard to the truth of ſuch topics, is admitted by thoſe who cannot entirely acquieſce in the concluſion, he would infallibly deſpair of reaping any inſtruction, that could be depended on, from the ſtudy of the Bible; and would be almoſt tempted to pronounce it altogether unprofitable.

What can exceed the declarations to this purpoſe of the celebrated Father Simon, a very eminent critic, and probably the greateſt oriental ſcholar of his age? "We ought," ſays he*, "to regard it as unqueſtionable, that the greater part of the Hebrew words "are equivocal, and that their ſignification is *entirely* "uncertain. For this reaſon, when a tranſlator em"ploys in his verſion the interpretation which he "thinks the beſt, he cannot ſay abſolutely that that "interpretation expreſſes truly what is contained in "the original. There is *always* ground to doubt whe"ther the ſenſe which he gives to the Hebrew words "be the true ſenſe, becauſe there are other meanings "which are *equally* probable." Again†, "They [the "Proteſtants] do not conſider that even the moſt learn"ed Jews doubt almoſt every where concerning the "the proper ſignification of the Hebrew words, and "that the Hebrew lexicons compoſed by them, com"monly contain nothing but uncertain conjectures." Now, if matters were really as here repreſented, there could be no queſtion that the ſtudy of Scripture would be mere loſs of time, and that, whatever might be affirmed of the ages of the ancient prophets, it could not be ſaid at preſent, that there is any revelation extant of what preceded the times of the apoſtles. For a revelation which contains nothing but matter of doubt and conjecture, and from which I cannot raiſe even a probable opinion that is not counterbalanced by opinions equally probable, is no revelation at all. How defective, on this hypotheſis, the New-Teſtament would be, which every where preſuppoſes the knowledge and belief of the Old; and in many places, how inexplicable without that knowledge, it is needleſs to mention.

§ 2. It would not be eaſy to account for exaggerations ſo extravagant in an author ſo judicious, and commonly ſo moderate, but by obſerving that his immediate aim, whereof he never loſes ſight, throughout his whole elaborate performance, is to eſtabliſh TRADITION as the foundation of all the knowledge neceſſary for the faith and practice of a Chriſtian. *Scripture*, doubtleſs, has its difficulties; but we know at leaſt what and where it is. As for tradition, what it is, how it is to be ſought, and where it is to be found, it has never yet been in the power of any man to explain to the ſatisfaction of a reaſonable inquirer. We are already in poſſeſſion of the former, if we can but expound it. We cannot ſay ſo much of the latter, which, like Nebuchadnezzar's dream, we have firſt to find, and then to interpret.

I am not ignorant that Simon's principal aim has been repreſented by ſome of his own communion, particularly Bouſſet biſhop of Meaux, as ſtill more hoſtile to religion, than from the account above given we ſhould conclude it to be. That celebrated and ſubtle diſputant

* Hiſt. Crit. du. V. T. liv. iii ch. ii. On doit ſuppoſer comme une choſe conſtante, que la plus part des mots Hebreux ſont equivoques, et que leur ſignification eſt *entierement* incertaine. C'eſt pourquoi lors qu'un traducteur employe dans ſa verſion l'interpretation qu'il juge la meilleure, on ne peut pas dire abſolument, que cette interpretation exprime au vrai ce qui eſt contenu dans l'original. Il y a *toujours* lieu de douter, ſi le ſens qu'on donne aux mots Hebreux eſt le veritable, puis qu'il y en a d'autres qui ont *autant* de probabilité.

† Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. iii. ch. iv. Ils n'ont pas pris garde, que meme les plus ſçavans Juifs doutent preſque par tout de la ſignification propre des mots Hebreux, et que les dictionaires qu'ils ont compoſés de la langue Hebraïque ne contiennent le plus ſouvent que de conjectures incertaines.

diſputant did not heſitate to maintain that, under the ſpecious pretext of ſupporting the authority of the church, this prieſt of the Oratory undermined Chriſtianity itſelf, a proceeding which in the end muſt prove fatal to an authority that has no other foundation to reſt upon. The biſhop accordingly inſiſts that, the general tendency of his argument, as appears in every part of the work, is to inſinuate a refined Socinianiſm, if not an univerſal ſcepticiſm. Certain it is, that the ambiguous manner often adopted by our critical hiſtorian, and the addreſs with which he ſometimes eludes the expectation of his readers, add not a little probability to the reaſoning of this acute antagoniſt. When to any flagrant miſinterpretation of a portion of Scripture mentioned in his work, we expect his anſwer from a critical examination of the paſſage, we are ſilenced with the tradition and authority of the church, urged in ſuch a way as evidently ſuggeſts, that without recurring to her deciſion, there is no poſſibility of refuting the objections of adverſaries, or diſcovering the truth; and that our own reaſonings unchecked by her, if they did not ſubvert our faith altogether, would infallibly plunge us into all the errors of Socinus. Thus moſt of his diſcuſſions concerning the import of the ſacred text conclude in an alternative which, whilſt it conceals his own ſentiments, bewilders his readers. The purport is, 'If ye will be rational, ye muſt ſoon ceaſe to 'be Chriſtians; and if ye will be Chriſtians, ye muſt '(wherever religion is concerned) ceaſe to be rational.' This alternative of faith or reaſon, though not expreſſed in ſo many words, is but too plainly implied in thoſe he uſes. If for *Chriſtian* he had ſubſtituted *Roman Catholic*, or even any one denomination of Chriſtians, the ſentiment would not have been ſo generally controverted. As it is, he offers no other choice, but to believe every thing, how abſurd ſoever, on an authority into the foundations of which we are not permitted to enquire, or to believe nothing at all. The critical hiſtory has accordingly been obſerved to produce two contrary effects on readers of oppoſite characters. Of the weak and timid it often makes *implicit believers*; of the intelligent and daring it makes *free-thinkers*. To which ſide the author himſelf leaned moſt, it would perhaps be preſumptuous to ſay. But as his perſonal character and known abilities were much more congenial to thoſe of the latter claſs than to thoſe of the former, it was no wonder that he fell under ſuſpicion with ſome ſhrewd but zealous Catholics, who looked on his zeal for tradition as no better than a diſguiſe. But this only by the way. I mean not to conſider here what was his real and ultimate ſcope in the treatiſe above mentioned: it is enough for my purpoſe to examine his profeſſed intention, which is to ſupport tradition by repreſenting ſcripture as, in conſequence of its obſcurity, inſufficient evidence of any doctrine.

That Simon's aſſertions above quoted are without bounds hyperbolical, can ſcarcely be doubted by any perſon who reflects. Of the prophetical writings I am not now to ſpeak, though even, with regard to them, it were eaſy to ſhow that ſuch things could not be affirmed in an entire conſiſtency with truth. As to the hiſtorical books, I hope to prove, notwithſtanding all that has been evinced on one ſide and admitted on the other, that they are, in general, remarkable for perſpicuity. It is true that our knowledge of the tongue, for the reaſons above mentioned, is defective; but it is alſo true, that this defect is ſeldom ſo great as materially to darken the hiſtory, eſpecially the more early part of it.

§ 3. THE firſt quality for which the ſacred hiſtory is remarkable is ſimplicity. The Hebrew is a ſimple language. Their verbs have not like Greek and Latin, a variety of moods and tenſes, nor do they, like the modern languages, abound in auxiliaries and conjunctions. The conſequence is, that in narrative they expreſs by ſeveral ſimple ſentences, much in the way of the relations uſual in converſation, what in moſt other languages would be comprehended in one complex ſentence of three or four members. Though the latter method has many advantages, in reſpect of elegance, harmony, and variety, and is eſſential to what is ſtrictly called ſtyle; the former is incomparably more perſpicuous. Accordingly we may often obſerve that unlettered people who are very attentive to a familiar ſtory told in their own homely manner, and perfectly underſtand it, quickly loſe attention to almoſt any written hiſtory, even the moſt intereſting, the hiſtory contained in the Scriptures alone excepted. Nor is the ſole reaſon of this exception, becauſe they are more accuſtomed to that hiſtory than to any other, though no doubt this circumſtance contributes to the effect; but it is chiefly becauſe the ſimplicity of the diction brings it to the level of ordinary talk, and conſequently does not put the minds of people who are no readers, ſo much to the ſtretch, as what is written, even in the leaſt laboured ſtyle of compoſition, in any modern tongue, does in regard to thoſe acquainted with the tongue.

§ 4. Take for an example of the ſimplicity here meant, the firſt paragraph of Geneſis, conſiſting of five not long verſes, and containing not fewer than eleven ſentences. The common punctuation does not indeed make them ſo many. But that is of no moment. When ſentences are very ſhort, we uſually ſeparate them by ſemicolons, ſometimes by commas; but that is a complete ſentence, in whatever way pointed, which conveys a meaning fully enunciated, and intelligible, independently of what precedes or what

follows; when what precedes, and what follows, is alſo intelligible independently of it. 1. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.* 2. *And the earth was without form and void.* 3. *And darkneſs was upon the face of the deep.* 4. *And the ſpirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.* 5. *And God ſaid, Let there be light.* 6. *And there was light.* 7. *And God ſaw the light, that it was good.* 8. *And God divided the light from the darkneſs.* 9. *And God called the light day.* 10. *And the darkneſs he called night.* 11. *And the evening and the morning were the firſt day.* This is a juſt repreſentation of the ſtrain of the original. A more perfect example of ſimplicity of ſtructure we can no where find. The ſentences are ſimple; the ſubſtantives are not attended by adjectives, nor the verbs by adverbs, no ſynonymas, no ſuperlatives, no effort at expreſſing things in a bold, emphatical, or uncommon manner.

In order to judge of the difference of this manner from that of ordinary compoſitions, we need only compare with it Caſtalio's verſion of the paſſage into Latin, wherein all, except the firſt ſentence and the laſt, and conſequently nine of thoſe above recited, are compriſed in one complicated period. "1. *Principio* "*creavit Deus cœlum et terram.* 2. *Quum autem eſſet* "*terra iners atque rudis, tenebriſque effuſum profundum,* "*et divinus ſpiritus ſeſe ſuper aquas libraret, juſſit Deus* "*ut exiſteret lux, et extitit lux; quam quum videret* "*Deus eſſe bonam, lucem ſecrevit a tenebris, et lucem* "*diem, et tenebras noctem appellavit.* 3. *Ita extitit ex* "*veſpere et mane dies primus.*" Compare with this the verſion of the ſame paſſage in the vulgate, which is literal like the Engliſh. "*In principio creavit Deus* "*cœlum et terram. Terra autem erat inanis et vacua,* "*et tenebræ erant ſuper faciem abyſſi: Et ſpiritus Dei* "*ferebatur ſuper aquas. Dixitque Deus, Fiat lux. Et facta* "*eſt lux. Et vidit Deus lucem quod eſſet bona. Et diviſit lucem* "*a tenebris. Appellavitque lucem diem, et tenebras noctem.* "*Factumque eſt veſpere et mane dies unus.*" The difference between theſe in point of perſpicuity, is to an ordinary hearer extremely great. So much depends on the ſimplicity of ſtructure, neceſſarily ariſing in ſome degree from the form of the language. Nothing is more characteriſtic of the ſimple manner than the introduction of what is ſpoken, directly in the words of the ſpeaker; whereas in the periodic ſtyle we are informed obliquely of its purport. Thus what is in the vulgate, "*Dixit Deus*, Fiat lux," is in Caſtalio, "*Juſſit Deus* ut exiſteret lux."

§ 5. But beſides this, there is a ſimplicity of ſentiment, particularly in the Pentateuch, ariſing from the very nature of the early and uncultivated ſtate of ſociety about which that book is converſant. This renders the narrative in general extremely clear and engaging. Simple manners are more eaſily deſcribed than manners highly poliſhed and refined. Being alſo adapted to the ordinary ranks of people and to all capacities, they much more generally excite attention and intereſt the heart. It has been remarked, not unjuſtly, that though no two authors wrote in languages more widely different both in genius and in form, than Moſes and Homer, or treated of people who in their religions opinions and ceremonies were more oppoſite than were the Hebrews and the Greeks, we ſhall hardly find any who reſemble one another more than theſe writers, in an affecting and perſpicuous ſimplicity, which ſuits almoſt every taſte, and is level to every underſtanding. Let it be obſerved than in this compariſon I have no alluſion to imagery, or to any quality of diction, except that above mentioned. Now nothing contributes more to this reſemblance than this circumſtance which they have in common, that both preſent to our view a rude, becauſe little cultivated, ſtate of human beings and politics. The paſſions and the motives of the men recorded by them, diſplay themſelves without diſguiſe. There is ſomething wonderfully ſimple and artleſs even in the artifices related in their writings. If nature be not always exhibited by them naked ſhe is dreſſed in a plain decent garb, which, far from diſguiſing, accommodates her, and ſhows her to advantage. Natural beauties pleaſe always and univerſally; artificial ornaments depend for their effect on mode and caprice. They pleaſe particular perſons only or nations, and at particular times. Now, as the writers above mentioned, though in many reſpects very diſſimilar, reſemble each other in this ſpecies of ſimplicity, they alſo reſemble in a certain native perſpicuity invariably reſulting therefrom.

§ 6. Homer is thought by many the moſt perſpicuous writer in Greek; yet in reſpect of idiom and dialect he is ſo peculiar, that one is leſs aſſiſted to underſtand him by the other compoſitions in the language, than to underſtand any other Greek writer in proſe or verſe. One would almoſt think that the only uſage in the tongue which can enable us to read him is his own. Were we therefore to judge from general topics which might plauſibly be declaimed upon, we ſhould conclude that the Iliad and the Odyſſey are among the darkeſt books in the language; yet they are in fact the cleareſt. In matters of criticiſm it is likewiſe unſafe to form general concluſions from a few examples, which may be pompouſly diſplayed, and, when brought into view together, made appear conſiderable, but are as nothing in number, compared with thoſe with which it is poſſible to contraſt them.

§ 7. Indeed moſt of Simon's inſtances, in ſupport of his doctrine of the impenetrable darkneſs of ſcripture, appear to me rather as evidences of the ſtrait he was in to find appoſite examples, than as tolerable proofs

proofs of his opinion. For my part, I frankly own that, from the conviction I had of the profound erudition and great abilities of the man, I was much more inclined to his opinion before, than after, the perusal of his proofs. At firſt I could not avoid ſuſpecting that a man of his character muſt have had ſomething extraordinary, to which I had not attended, to advance, in ſupport of ſo extraordinary a poſition. I was at the ſame time certain that, as it was a point he had much at heart to enforce, the proofs he would bring from examples in ſupport of it, would be the ſtrongeſt he could find.

Let us then conſider ſome of the principal of theſe examples. What pains has he not taken to ſhow that ברא *bara*, does not neceſſarily imply, *to make out of nothing?* But if it do not, can any man conſider this as an evidence of either the ambiguity or the obſcurity of Hebrew? The doctrine that God made the world out of nothing, does not reſt upon the import of that verb, but on the whole narration, particularly on the firſt verſe of Geneſis compared with thoſe which follow; whence we learn that God firſt made the chaotic matter, out of which he afterwards formed the material beings whereof the world is compoſed. But paſſing this; for I mean not here to enquire into the grounds of that article, but into the obſcurity of Scripture; who ſees not that the original term is not more ambiguous or more obſcure than thoſe by which it is rendered in other languages? Is ποιεω, or even κτιζω in Greek, *creo* in Latin, or *create* in Engliſh, more definite? Not in the leaſt, as we may learn from the common dictionaries of theſe languages. In regard even to the ſcriptural uſe of the Engliſh word, God, in the two chapters of Geneſis, is ſaid, in the common verſion, to have *created* thoſe very things, of which we are alſo told, that he formed them out of the ground and out of the water. Are theſe languages then (and as much may be ſaid of all the languages I know) perfectly ambiguous and obſcure? "It is," ſays Simon*, "the tradition of the ſyna-"gogue and of the church, which limits the vague meaning of theſe firſt words of Geneſis." But if words be accounted *vague*, becauſe they are general expreſſions, under which ſeveral terms more ſpecial are included, the much greater part of the nouns as well as the verbs, not of the oriental tongues only, but of every tongue, ancient and modern, muſt be denominated vague. Every name muſt be ſo that is not a proper name; the name of a ſpecies, becauſe applicable to many individuals; more ſo the name of a genus, becauſe applicable to many ſpecies; and ſtill more ſo, the name of a claſs or order, becauſe applicable to many genera.

Would it not be an abuſe of words to ſay that a man ſpoke vaguely, equivocally, or darkly, who told me that he had built a *houſe* for himſelf, becauſe the verb *to build* does not ſuggeſt what the materials of the building were, whether ſtone or brick, or wood, to any of which it may be equally applied; and becauſe the noun *houſe* may equally denote a houſe of one ſtory, or of ſeven ſtories, forty feet long, or four hundred? As far as the information went, the expreſſion was clear and unequivocal. But it did not preclude the poſſibility of farther information on the ſubject. And what ſingle affirmation ever does preclude this? Are we informed of nothing when we are told that God *made all things?* And if it ſhould be added *out of nothing*, would not this be accounted additional information, and not the removal of any obſcurity in the foregoing? Would we not judge in the ſame manner, ſhould a man, after acquainting us that he had built his houſe, add, that it was of marble, ſeventy feet long, and three ſtories high? yet there would be ſtill ſcope for further enquiry, and further information. Is a man told nothing who is not told every thing? And is every word obſcure or ambiguous, that does not convey all the information that can be given upon the ſubject? This way of proving, adopted by our learned critic, is indeed a novelty of its kind.

§ 8. ANOTHER of his examples is the word צבא *tſaba*†, rendered by the Seventy κοσμος, in the Vulgate *ornatus*, and by our tranſlators *hoſt*. Though this word be admitted to be equivocal taken by itſelf, as moſt nouns in every language are, its import in this paſſage is clearly aſcertained by the context to be metaphorical. Whether therefore it be rendered *hoſt* with the Engliſh interpreters, κοσμος with the Greek, or *ornatus* with the Latin, it makes no conceivable variation in the ſenſe. Nobody, in reading our tranſlation, ever thinks of an army of men, in the literal acceptation, muſtered in the ſky. Nor is the diverſity at all material, when the purport of the whole ſentence is conſidered, between the different verſions which have been given of the two Hebrew words תהו *thohu* and בהו *bohu* ‡. All concur in making them expreſſive of chaos.

§ 9. As to the verſion, which, according to him, may be given to the three firſt verſes of Geneſis §,

* Reponſe aux Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hollande, ch. 16.

† Gen. ii. 1. The whole verſe is in the common verſion: *Thus the heavens and the earth were finiſhed and all the* hoſt *of them.*

‡ Rendered in the Engliſh tranſlation, *without form and void*, Gen. i. 2.

§ The verſion is, "*Avant que Dieu crea le ciel et la terre, que la terre etoit ſans forme, &c. que les tenebres etoient, &c. et que* "*l'eſprit de Dieu, &c. Dieu dit que la lumiere, ſoit,*" &c. Literally in Engliſh, *Before that God created the heavens and the earth, that*

making of five or six simple sentences one complex period, little more is necessary than to remark, that its very want of simplicity in such a book, written in so early an age, is a very strong presumption against it, being not less unsuited to the time of the historian, than it is to the genius of the language. In what respect he could call it literal, or agreeable to the grammatical sense, I do not know; since it evidently departs from the ordinary import, as well as the usual construction of the words, and that not for giving light to a passage otherwise obscure (which may reasonably excuse a small deviation from the letter), but for involving in darkness what is expressed perspicuously. It is, besides, quite arbitrary. The copulative is thrice rendered "*Que*," *that*; the fourth time it is omitted; and what follows is in the perfect of the indicative, the preceding clauses being in the potential or subjunctive mood. Now I may venture to affirm, that no conceivable reason can be assigned, why this clause should be made choice of for the direct affirmation, and not any of those preceding or following in the paragraph.

Add to all this, that to make בראשית *bereshith*, a conjunction, and render it, "*priusquam*," *avant que*, is not only without, but against Biblical authority. ראשית *beginning*, is a very common noun, and joined with the prepositive ב signifying *in*, occurs in four places besides this. In these it is uniformly rendered as here, ἐν ἀρχῇ in the Septuagint, and *in principio* in the Vulgate, and cannot, in a consistency with the words connected, be rendered otherwise. In the Targum or Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos on the books of Moses, which in point of antiquity comes next to the Septuagint, it is rendered בקדמין, *in pricipiis*, in conformity to every other translation.

The opinion of Grotius and some learned Rabbis, unsupported by either argument or example, nay, in manifest contradiction to both is here of no weight. Scriptural usage alone must decide the question. These commentators (with all deference to their erudition and abilities be it spoken) being comparatively modern, cannot be considered as ultimate judges in a question depending entirely on an ancient use, whereof all the evidences that were remaining in their time, remain still, and are as open to our examination, as they were to theirs. In other points where there may happen to be in scripture an allusion to customs or ceremonies, retained by the Jews, but unknown to us, the case is different. But nothing of this kind is pretended here. It is therefore needless to enter further into particulars.—What has been produced above will serve for a specimen of the evidence, brought by Father Simon, of the obscurity of the Hebrew Scriptures. And I imagine that by the like arguments I might undertake to prove any writing, ancient or modern, to be vague, ambiguous, and obscure.

§ 10. THAT some things, however, in the sacred history, not of great consequence, are ambiguous, and some things obscure, it was never my intention to question. But such things are to be found in every composition, in every language. Indeed, as the word *perspicuous* is a relative term (for that may be perspicuous to one which is obscure to another), it must be allowed also that the dead languages have, in this respect, a disadvantage, which is always the greater, the less the language is known. As to the multiplicity of meanings sometimes affixed to single words, one would be at a loss to say what tongue, ancient or modern, is most chargeable with this blemish. Any person accustomed to consult lexicons will readily assent to what I say. In regard to English (in which we know that it is not impossible to write both unambiguously and perspicuously), if we recur to Johnson's valuable Dictionary for the signification of the most common terms, both nouns and verbs, and overlook, for a moment, our acquaintance with the tongue, confirmed by long and uninterrupted habit, we shall be surprised that people can write intelligibly in it, and be apt to imagine that, in every period, nay, in every line, a reader will be perplexed in selecting the proper, out of such an immense variety of meanings as are given to the different words *. In this view of things the explanation of a simple sentence will appear like the solution of a riddle.

§ 11. BUT no sooner do we return to practice, than these imaginations, founded merely on a theoretical and partial view of the subject, totally disappear. Nothing can be more pertinent, or better founded, than the remark of Mr. le Clerc, "That "a word which is equivocal by itself, is often so "clearly limited to a particular signification by the "strain of the discourse, as to leave no room for "doubt." Nor has Simon paid a due regard to this most evident truth, though he pretends, in answering that writer, to have been aware of it †. He could not otherwise have run into such exaggerations as these: "The signification of the greater part "of the Hebrew words is *entirely* uncertain;" and "a translator cannot say absolutely, that his interpre-"tation expresses truly what is contained in the ori-"ginal, there being *always* ground to doubt, because "there

that the earth was without form and void, that darkness was upon the face of the deep, and that the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; God said, Let there be light, and there was light, Hist. Crit. de V. T. liv. iii. ch. iii. He mentions also another rendering: *Au commencement que, &c.* But this seems only a more awkward way of expressing the same thing.

* Thus to the noun *word* Johnson assigns 12 significations—to *power* 13, and to *foot* 16. The verb *to make* has, according to him, 66 meanings, *to put* 80, and *to take*, which is both neuter and active, has 134. This is but a small specimen in nouns and verbs; the observation may be as amply illustrated in the other parts of speech.

† Reponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Holl. ch. xvi.

" there are other meanings which are *equally* pro-
" bable;" abſurdities, which it were eaſy to con-
fute from his own work, were this the proper place.

§ 12. It may be aſked in reply, But is not the poverty of the Hebrew tongue, of which the obſcurity and the ambiguity ſeem to be the natural conſequences, acknowledged by all impartial critics? In ſome ſenſe it is, and I have acknowledged it very amply; but it deſerves our notice, that much more has been inferred from this than there is foundation for. The language of a people little advanced in civilization, amongſt whom knowledge of any kind has made but inconſiderable progreſs, and the arts of life are yet rude and imperfect, can hardly be ſuppoſed copious. But it is not ſufficiently weighed, on the other hand, that if their words be few, their ideas are few in proportion. Words multiply with the occaſions for employing them. And if in modern languages we have thouſands of names, to which we can find none in Hebrew correſponding, we ſhall diſcover, upon enquiry, that the Hebrews were ignorant of the things to which thoſe names are affixed by us as the ſigns.

Knowledge precedes, language follows. No people have names for things unknown and unimagined, about which they can have no converſation. If they be well ſupplied in ſigns for expreſſing thoſe things with which they are, either in reality or in imagination, acquainted, their language, conſidered relatively to the needs of the people who uſe it, may be termed copious; though, compared with the languages of more intelligent and civilized nations, it be accounted ſcanty. This is a ſcantineſs, which might occaſion difficulty to a ſtranger attempting to tranſlate into it the writings of a more poliſhed and improved people, who have more ideas as well as words, but would never be felt by the natives; nor would it hurt in the leaſt the clearneſs of their narratives, concerning thoſe matters which fall within the ſphere of their knowledge. There is no defect of ſigns for all the things which they can ſpeak or write about, and it can never affect the perſpicuity of what they do ſay, that they have no ſigns for thoſe things whereof they have nothing to ſay, becauſe they know nothing about them.

Nay, it may be reaſonably inferred, that in what is called a ſcanty language, where the ſigns are few, becauſe the things to be ſignified are few, there is a greater probability of preciſion than in a copious language, where the requiſite ſigns are much more numerous, by reaſon of the multiplicity of things to be repreſented by them. The leaſt deviation from order will be obſerved in a ſmall company, which would be overlooked in a crowd. The ſource of much falſe reaſoning on this head, is the tendency people have to imagine that, with the ſame extent of ſubject which might have employed the pen of an ancient Greek, the Hebrews had perhaps not one fourth part of their number of words. Had this been the caſe, the words muſt indeed have been uſed very indefinitely. But as the caſe really ſtood, it is not ſo eaſy to decide, whether the terms (thoſe eſpecially for which there is moſt occaſion in narrative) be more vague in their ſignification in Hebrew, than in other languages.

§ 13. But to deſcend from abſtract reaſoning to matters of fact, which in ſubjects of this kind are more convincing, "It is falſe," ſays Le Clerc, "that "there is always ground to doubt whether the ſenſe "which one gives to the Hebrew words be the true "ſenſe; for, in ſpite of all the ambiguities of the He-"brew tongue, all the interpreters of Scripture, an-"cient and modern, agree with regard to the greater "part of the hiſtory, and of the Jewiſh religion." Le Clerc is rather modeſt in his aſſertions: but in fact he was too much of Simon's opinion on this article, as appears particularly from his Prolegomena to the Pentateuch *. Otherwiſe he might have juſtly aſſerted that the points rendered doubtful by the obſcurity or the ambiguity of the text, bear not to thoſe which are evident, the proportion of one to an hundred in number, and not of one to a thouſand in importance. Let it be obſerved that I ſpeak only of the doubts ariſing from the obſcurity of Scripture; for, as to thoſe which may be ſtarted by curioſity concerning circumſtances not mentioned, ſuch doubts are, on every ſubject, ſacred and prophane, innumerable. But in queſtions of this ſort, it is a maxim with every true and conſiſtent Proteſtant, that the faith of a Chriſtian is not concerned.

Simon's reply is affectedly evaſive. At the ſame time that it in fact includes a conceſſion ſubverſive of the principles he had advanced, it is far ſhort of what every perſon of reflection muſt ſee to be the truth. He tells us that "he never doubted, that one might under-"ſtand Hebrew well enough to know *in groſs* and *in* "*general*, the Biblical hiſtories; but this *general* and "*confuſed* knowledge does not ſuffice for fixing the "mind in what regards the articles of our belief †." Now what this author meant by *knowing in groſs* and *in general*, (which is a more vague expreſſion than any I remember in the Pentateuch), I will not attempt to explain; but it is not in my power to conceive any kind of knowledge, groſs or pure, general or ſpecial, deducible from a writing wherein "there is *always* "ground to doubt whether the ſenſe aſſigned be the "true ſenſe, becauſe there are other meanings which "are

* Diſſertation i. chap. vi

† "Mr. Simon n'a jamais douté qu'on n'eut aſſez de connoiſſance de la langue Hebraïque pour ſavoir *en gros* et *en general* les "hiſtoires de la Bible. Mais cette connoiſſance *general* et *confuſe* ne ſuffit pas pour l'arrêter l'eſprit dans ce qui regarde les points "de nôtre creance." Reponſe aux Sentimens de quelq. Theolog. de Holl. ch. xvi.

"are *equally* probable." There is in theſe poſitions a manifeſt contradiction. When the probabilities in the oppoſite ſcales balance each other, there can reſult no knowledge, no nor even a reaſonable opinion. The mind is in total ſuſpenſe between the contrary but equal evidences.

§ 14. But to be more particular; what hiſtorical point of moment recorded in Geneſis, is interpreted differently by Jews of any denomination, Phariſees, Sadducees, Karaites, or even Samaritans? Let it be obſerved that I ſpeak only of their literal or grammatical interpretations of the acknowledged text, and neither of their interpolations, nor of their myſtical expoſitions and allegories, which are as various as men's imaginations: for with theſe it is evident that the perſpicuity of the tongue is noway concerned. Or is there one material difference, in what concerns the hiſtory, among Chriſtians of adverſe ſects, Greeks, Romaniſts, and Proteſtants; or even between Jews and Chriſtians? This book has been tranſlated into a great many languages, ancient and modern, into thoſe of Aſia, Africa, and Europe. Is not every thing that can be denominated an event of conſequence ſimilarly exhibited in them all? In all we find one God, and only one, the maker of heaven and earth, and of every thing that they contain. From all we learn that the world was made in ſix days, that God reſted the ſeventh. All agree in the work of each day, in giving man dominion over the brute creation, in the formation of the woman out of the body of the man, in the prohibition of the tree of knowledge, in man's tranſgreſſion and its conſequences, in the murder of Abel by his brother Cain, in the deluge, in the preſervation of Noah's family, and of the animal world, by the ark, in the confuſion of tongues, in the hiſtories given of the patriarchs.

It were tedious, I had almoſt ſaid endleſs, to enumerate every thing. Take the ſtory of Joſeph for an example, the only one I ſhall ſpecify. In what verſion of that moſt intereſting narrative, oriental or occidental, ancient or modern, Jewiſh or Chriſtian, Popiſh or Proteſtant, is any thing which can be juſtly called material, repreſented differently from what it is in the reſt? Do we not clearly perceive in every one of them the partiality of the parent, the innocent ſimplicity of the child, the malignant envy of the brothers, their barbarous purpoſe ſo cruelly executed, their artifice for deceiving their father, the young man's ſlavery in Egypt, his prudence, fidelity, piety, chaſtity, the infamous attempt of his miſtreſs, and the terrible revenge ſhe took of his virtuous refuſal, his impriſonment, his behaviour in priſon, the occaſion of his releaſe, Pharaoh's dreams, and Joſeph's interpretation, the exaltation of the latter in Egypt, the years of plenty and the years of famine, the interviews he had with his brothers, and the affecting manner in which he at laſt diſcovered himſelf to them? Is there any one moral leſſon that may be deduced from any part of this hiſtory, (and none ſurely can be more inſtructive), which is not ſufficiently ſupported by every tranſlation with which we are acquainted? Or is this coincidence of tranſlations, in every material circumſtance, conſiſtent with the repreſentations which have been given of the total obſcurity and ambiguity of the original? The reverſe certainly.

§ 15. Nor is it neceſſary, in this enquiry, to confine one's ſelf to the points merely hiſtorical, though, for brevity's ſake, I have done it. Permit me only to add in a ſentence, that the religious inſtitutions, the laws and the ceremonies of the Jews, as far as they are founded on the expreſs words of Scripture, and neither on tradition, nor on traditionary gloſſes, are, in every thing material, underſtood in the very ſame way by both Jews and Chriſtians. The principal points on which the Jewiſh ſects differ ſo widely from one another, are ſupported, if not by the oral traditive law, at leaſt by myſtical ſenſes, attributed by one party, and not acquieſced in by others, to thoſe paſſages of Scripture, about the literal meaning whereof all parties are agreed.

§ 16. Yet our critic will have it, that our knowledge of theſe things is *confuſed* and *general*. He had granted more, as we have ſeen, than was compatible with his bold aſſertions above quoted; and therefore to diſguiſe a little the inconſiſtency of thoſe aſſertions with the conceſſion now made, he encumbers it with the epithets *confuſed* and *general*. But let the fact ſpeak for itſelf. Had there been any ſource of confuſion in the original, was it poſſible that there ſhould have been ſuch a harmony in tranſlations made into languages ſo different, and by men who, in many things that concern religion, were of ſentiments ſo contrary? But if this knowledge be *confuſed and general*, I ſhould like to be informed what this author, and thoſe who think as he does, would denominate *diſtinct and particular*. For my part, I have not a more diſtinct and particular notion of any hiſtory, I ever read in any language, than of that written by Moſes. And if there has not been ſuch a profuſion of criticiſm, on the obſcurities and ambiguities which occur in other authors, it is to be aſcribed ſolely to this circumſtance, that what claims to be matter of revelation, awakens a cloſer attention, and excites a more ſcrupulous examination, than any other performance which, how valuable ſoever, is infinitely leſs intereſting to mankind. Nor is there a ſingle principle by which our knowledge of the import of ſacred writ, eſpecially in what relates to Jewiſh and Chriſtian antiquities, could be overturned, that would not equally involve all ancient literature in univerſal ſcepticiſm.

§ 17. Some perhaps will be ready to conclude from what

what has been advanced, that all new tranſlations of Scripture muſt be ſuperfluous, ſince the language is ſo clear, that no preceding tranſlator has miſſed the ſenſe in points of conſequence. It is indeed true, that no tranſlator, that I know, has miſſed the ſenſe in points of principal conſequence, whether hiſtorical events, articles of faith, or rules of practice; inſomuch that we may with Brown ſafely deſire the ſceptic *, "to "chuſe which he ſhould like beſt or worſt among all "the controverted copies, various readings, manu- "ſcripts, and catalogues, adopted by whatever church, "ſect or party; or even any of the almoſt infinite "number of tranſlations made of theſe books in diſtant "countries and ages, relying on it as amply ſufficient "for all the great purpoſes of religion and Chriſtianity."

Yet it is not to be argued that, becauſe the worſt copy or tranſlation contains all the eſſentials of religion, it is not of real conſequence, by being acquainted with the beſt, to guard againſt errors which, though comparatively of ſmaller moment, and not ſubverſive of the foundation, impair the integrity, and often injure the conſiſtency, as well as weaken the evidence, of our religious knowledge. Although the moſt eſſential truths are the moſt obvious, and acceſſible to the unlearned, as well as the learned, we ought not to think lightly of any advances attainable in the divine ſcience. There is a ſatisfaction which the well-diſpoſed mind receives from an increaſe of knowledge, that of itſelf does more than repay all the labour employed in the acquiſition. If this hold even in ordinary ſubjects, how much more in the moſt ſublime? There is, beſides, ſuch a ſymmetry of parts in the divine inſtitution we have by Jeſus Chriſt, that a more thorough acquaintance with each part, ſerves to illuſtrate the other parts, and confirm our faith in the whole. And whatever in any degree corroborates our faith, contributes in the ſame degree to ſtrengthen our hope, to enhance our love, and to give additional weight to all the motives with which our religion ſupplies us, to a pious and virtuous life.

Theſe are reaſons which ought to weigh with every Chriſtian, and the more eſpecially, as the moſt minute examination will never be found an unprofitable ſtudy, even to the moſt learned. It is with the good things of the Spirit, as with what are called the good things of life; the moſt neceſſary are the moſt common, and the moſt eaſily acquired. But as, in regard to the animal life, it would be a reproach on thoſe poſſeſſed of natural abilities, through torpid indolence, to look no further than mere neceſſaries, not exerting their powers for the attainment of thoſe conveniencies whereby their lives might be rendered both more comfortable to themſelves, and more beneficial to others; it is beyond compare more blameworthy to betray the ſame lazy diſpoſition, and the ſame indifference, in what concerns the ſpiritual life. Barely to have faith, does not ſatisfy the mind of the pious Chriſtian, whoſe ambition it is to be rich in faith. To have received of the celeſtial grace is not enough in point, either of acquirement or of evidence, to him whoſe ardent and daily deſire it is to grow in grace, and in the comforts of God's Spirit. Now, to make progreſs in divine knowledge, is (if I may be allowed the ſimilitude) to improve the ſoil in which faith, and hope, and charity, and all the graces of the Spirit, muſt be ſown and cultivated.

§ 18. But to return to the ſtyle of the ſacred hiſtory, from which I fear this controverſy, though exceedingly important and intimately connected with the ſubject, has made me digreſs too far; there is another ſpecies of ſimplicity, beſide the ſimplicity of ſtructure, and the ſimplicity of ſentiment above mentioned, for which, beyond all the compoſitions I know in any language, Scripture hiſtory is remarkable. This may be called ſimplicity of deſign. The ſubject of the narrative ſo engroſſes the attention of the writer, that he is himſelf as nobody, and is quite forgotten by the reader, who is never led by the tenor of the narration ſo much as to think of him. He introduces nothing as from himſelf. We have no opinions of his, no remarks, conjectures, doubts, inferences; no reaſonings about the cauſes or the effects of what is related. He never interrupts his reader with the diſplay of either his talents or his paſſions. He makes no digreſſions: he draws no characters: he gives us only the naked facts, from which we are left to collect the character. The utmoſt he does in characteriſing, and that but ſeldom, is compriſed in a very few words. And what is thus ſaid, is not produced as his opinion, either of the perſon or of the thing, but as the known verdict of the time, or perhaps, as the deciſion of the Spirit. No attempt to ſhine by means of the expreſſion, compoſition, or ſentiments. Plainneſs of language is always preferred, becauſe the moſt natural, the moſt obvious, and the beſt adapted to all capacities. Though in ſtyle by no means ſlovenly, yet in little points, as about thoſe grammatical accuracies which do not affect the ſenſe and perſpicuity of the ſentence, rather careleſs than curious.

§ 19. Now in the laſt of the three ſorts of ſimplicity enumerated, our Lord's biographers particularly excel. This quality, or ſomething akin to it, has been much and juſtly celebrated in ſome pagan writers, in Xenophon, for inſtance, among the Greeks, and Ceſar among the Latins. It were eaſy however to ſhow, were it a proper ſubject of diſcuſſion here, that the difference between theſe and the ſacred penmen, eſpecially the Evangeliſts, is very conſiderable. In reſpect of the

* Eſſays on the Characteriſtics, Eſſ. iii. Sect. 3.

the firſt ſpecies of ſimplicity mentioned, ſimplicity of ſtructure, the difference of the genius of the Greek language from that of the Hebrew, muſt no doubt occaſion ſome difference in the manner of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, from that of Moſes; but the identity of idiom explained in a former diſcourſe*, occaſions ſtill a ſtrong reſemblance between them. If Geneſis, therefore, may be juſtly ſaid to poſſeſs the firſt ſimplicity of compoſition in the ſentences, the Goſpels are certainly entitled to the ſecond. But even theſe are not, in this kind, entirely equal among themſelves. John and Matthew have it in a higher degree than Mark and Luke.

As to the ſecond ſpecies, ſimplicity of ſentiment, ariſing chiefly from the uncultivated ſtate of ſociety in the period and country about which the hiſtory is converſant; the change of times, which was doubtleſs very great, as well as the difference of ſubject, would neceſſarily confer the firſt degree here alſo upon the former. But in what was denominated ſimplicity of object or deſign, the Evangeliſts, of all writers, ſacred and profane, appear the foremoſt. Their manner is indeed in ſome reſpects peculiar and unrivalled. It may not be amiſs to conſider a little the circumſtances which gave occaſion to this diverſity and peculiarity.

§ 20. For this purpoſe I beg leave to lay before the reader the few following obſervations. 1ſt, I obſerve, that the ſtate and circumſtances of things were, before the times of the Apoſtles, totally changed in Paleſtine from what they had been in the times of the Patriarchs. The political alterations gradually brought upon the country, by a ſucceſſion of revolutions in government, which made their condition ſo very unlike the paſtoral life of their wandering forefathers, are too obvious to need illuſtration. 2dly, Their intercourſe with ſtrangers of different nations, to ſome of which they had been ſucceſſively in ſubjection, had, notwithſtanding their peculiarities in religion, introduced great changes in manners, ſentiments, and cuſtoms. In our Saviour's days we find the nation divided into religious ſects and political parties; the former of which had their reſpective ſyſtems, ſchools, and patrons among the learned. Each ſect had its axioms or leading principles, and its particular mode of reaſoning from thoſe principles. Now there is not a ſingle trace of any thing ſimilar to this in all the Old Teſtament hiſtory. 3dly, As the *great* object of our Lord's miniſtry, which is the *great* ſubject of the Goſpels, was to inculcate a doctrine and morality, with which none of their ſyſtems perfectly coincided; and as, by conſequence, he was oppoſed by all the principal men of the the different factions then in the nation, the greater part of his hiſtory muſt be employed in relating the inſtructions which he delivered to the people and to his diſciples, the diſputes which he had with his antagoniſts, and the methods by which he recommended and ſupported his doctrine, expoſed their ſophiſtry, and eluded their malice.

This muſt give a colour to the hiſtory of the Meſſiah, very different from that of any of the ancient worthies recorded in the Old Teſtament; in which, though very inſtructive, there is comparatively little delivered in the didactic ſtyle, and hardly any thing in the argumentative. A great deal of both we have in the Goſpels. It ought not here to paſs unnoticed, that it is more in compliance with popular language, than in ſtrict propriety, that I denominate his manner of enforcing moral inſtruction, *arguing*. Our Lord, addreſſing himſelf much more to the heart than to the head, and, by his admirable parables, without the form of argument, convincing his hearers, that the moral truths he recommended are conformable to the genuine principles of our nature, in other words, to the dictates of conſcience, and the common ſenſe of mankind, commands from the impartial and the conſiderate an unlimited aſſent. Accordingly, when a ſimilitude or an example is made to ſupply the place of argument, in ſupport of a particular ſentiment, he does not formally deduce the concluſion, but either leaves it to the reflections of his hearers, or draws it from their own mouths by a ſimple queſtion. This, without the parade of reaſoning, is, in practical ſubjects, the ſtrongeſt of all reaſoning. After candidly ſtating an appoſite caſe, it is appealing for the deciſion, not to the prejudices or the paſſions, but to the natural ſenſe of good and evil, even of his adverſaries. 4thly, As our Lord's hiſtory is occupied, partly with what he ſaid, and partly with what he did, this occaſions in the Goſpels a twofold diſtinction of ſtyle and manner; firſt, that of our Saviour, as it appears in what he ſaid; ſecondly, that of his hiſtorians, as it appears in their relation of what he did. I ſhall conſider briefly how the different ſorts of ſimplicity above mentioned, may be applied to each of theſe.

§ 21. As to the ſimplicity of ſtructure, it may be ſaid in a very eminent degree to belong to both. It is in itſelf regarded more as a quality of narration, but is by no means excluded from the other kinds of compoſition. Beſides, in our Lord's diſcourſes, particularly his parables, there is a great deal of narrative. Simplicity of ſentiment appears more in the dialogue part, and in the teaching, than in the narration, which is almoſt confined to what is neceſſary for information and connection. It may be objected, that our Lord's figurative manner of teaching is not perfectly compatible with ſimplicity. But let it be obſerved, that there

* Diſſertat. I. part 1.

is a ſimplicity of manner in the enunciation of the ſentiments directly ſignified, which a piece of writing that admits a figurative or allegorical meaning, is as ſuſceptible of, as one that admits only a literal interpretation. Greece has not produced a more genuine ſpecimen of this than we have in the Apologues of Eſop, which are all nevertheleſs to be underſtood figuratively. In Cebes's Table, which is an allegory, there is great ſimplicity of diction. It is only with the expreſſion of the literal or immediate ſentiment, that this quality is concerned. And nothing ſurely can in this particular exceed the parables of our Lord. As theſe are commonly in the ſtyle of narration, they are ſuſceptible of the ſame ſimplicity of ſtructure as well as of ſentiment, with the hiſtorian's narrative, and are, in this reſpect, hardly diſtinguiſhable from it.

But the third ſort mentioned belongs peculiarly to the hiſtorian. In our Lord's diſcourſes, though the general and ultimate object is the ſame throughout, namely the honour of God by the recovery of men, the particular and immediate object varies with the ſubject and occaſion. At one time it is to inſtruct his hearers in one important doctrine or duty, at another time in another; ſometimes to refute one error, at other times another; now to rebuke what is wrong, then again to encourage in the practice of what is right. We have all the variety of threats and promiſes, prohibitions and precepts, rebukes and conſolations, explanation and refutation, praiſe and blame. Theſe undoubtedly require a conſiderable variety in the ſtyle and manner. Now there is occaſion for nothing of this kind in the narrative. The hiſtorians with whom we are here concerned, do in their own character, neither explain nor command, promiſe nor threaten, commend nor blame, but preſerve one even tenor in exhibiting the facts entirely unembelliſhed, reporting, in ſingleneſs of heart, both what was ſaid, and what was done, by their maſter, likewiſe what was ſaid, and what was done, to him, by either friends or enemies. Not a ſyllable of encomium on the former, or of invective againſt the latter. As to their Lord himſelf, they appear to regard his character as infinitely ſuperior to any praiſe which they could beſtow: and as to his perſecutors, they mingle no gall in what they write concerning them; they do not deſire to aggravate their guilt, in the judgment of any man, either by giving expreſsly or by ſo much as inſinuating, through the ſeverity of their language, their opinion concerning it.

§ 22. Nay, which is more remarkable, the names of the high prieſt and his coadjutor, of the Roman procurator, of the tetrarch of Gallilee, and of the treacherous diſciple, are all that are mentioned of the many who had a hand in his proſecution and death. In regard to the four firſt, it is manifeſt that the ſuppreſſion of the names, had the facts been related, would have made no difference to contemporaries; for in offices of ſo great eminence poſſeſſed by ſingle perſons, as all thoſe offices were, the official is equivalent to the proper name, which it never fails to ſuggeſt; but ſuch a ſuppreſſion would have made to poſterity a material defect in the hiſtory, and greatly impaired its evidence. In regard to the fifth it is ſufficient to obſerve, that without naming the traitor, juſtice could not have been done to the eleven. Whereas of thoſe ſcribes and phariſees who bargained with Judas, of the men who apprehended Jeſus, of the officer who ſtruck him on the face at his trial, of the falſe witneſſes who depoſed againſt him, of thoſe who afterwards ſpat upon him buffeted and mocked him, of thoſe who were loudeſt in crying *Away with him; Crucify him; Not this man but Barrabas;* of thoſe who ſupplied the multitude with the implements of their mockery, the crown of thorns, the reed, and the ſcarlet robe, of thoſe who upbraided him on the croſs with his inability to ſave himſelf; or of the ſoldier who pierced his ſide with a ſpear; no name is given by any of the hiſtorians.

It may be ſaid, 'The names have not been known to them.' This may have been true of ſome of their names, but cannot be ſuppoſed to have been true of them all, and that, with regard not to one, two, or three, but to all the four Evangeliſts. The witneſſes muſt have been perſons of the country, and at leaſt occaſional hearers of our Lord. It was no doubt, chiefly the people of Jeruſalem, who tumultuouſly demanded his excution, who derided him with the title of Meſſiah, and who inſulted him even on the croſs. Curioſity on ſuch occaſions leads men to enquire about perſons who act a principal part in a ſcene ſo tragical; and that the diſciples were not beyond the influence of this motive, is evident from the whole of the ſtory. The names of the Roman ſoldiers concerned in this tranſaction might have been unknown to them, and probably little minded by them; but the actions of of their countrymen muſt have excited another kind of emotion, as it more nearly affected all his followers.

Now this reſerve in regard to the names of thoſe who were the chief inſtruments of his ſufferings, is the more obſervable, as the names of others to whom no ſpecial part is attributed, are mentioned without heſitation. Thus Malchus, whoſe ear Peter cut off, and who was immediately after miraculouſly cured by Jeſus, is named by John; but nothing further is told of him than, that he was preſent when our Lord was ſeized, and that he was a ſervant of the high prieſt. Simon the Cyrenian, who carried the croſs, is named by no fewer than three of the Evangeliſts; but we are alſo informed that in this ſervice he did not act voluntarily, but by compulſion. Joſeph of Arimathea and

Nicodemus are the only members of the Sanhedrim, except the high-prieſt, who are mentioned by name; but they were the only perſons of that body who did not concur in condemning the Son of God, and who, though once fearful and ſecret diſciples, aſſumed the reſolution to diſplay their affection at a time when no one elſe ventured openly to acknowledge him. Our Lord's biographers, whilſt they are thus far ready to do juſtice to merit, avoid naming any man without neceſſity, of whom they have nothing to ſay that is not to his diſhonour. To the virtuous and good they conciliate our eſteem and love, an effectual method of raiſing our admiration of virtue and goodneſs, and exciting in us a noble emulation; but our contempt and hatred they direct againſt the crimes, not againſt the perſons of men; againſt the vices, not againſt the vicious; aware that this laſt direction is often of the moſt dangerous tendency to Chriſtian charity, and conſequently to genuine virtue. They ſhowed no diſpoſition to hold up any man to the Chriſtians of their own time, as an object of either their fear or their abhorrence, or to tranſmit his name with infamy to poſterity.

Though this holds principally in what concerns the laſt great cataſtrophe, it appears in ſome degree in every part of the hiſtory. Except in the caſe of Herodias, which, from the rank of the perſonages concerned, muſt have been a matter of notoriety and public ſcandal, and therefore required a more public reprehenſion, the names are never mentioned, when what is related reflects diſgrace on the perſons. Of the Scribes and Phariſees who watched our Lord, and, on different occaſions, diſſembling eſteem, aſſailed him with captious and enſnaring queſtions, of thoſe who openly aſcribed his miracles to Beelzebub, called him a madman, a demoniac, and what they accounted worſe than either, a Samaritan, who accuſed him of aſſociating with the profligate, of Sabbath-breaking, of intemperance and blaſphemy, of thoſe Sadducees who by their ſophiſtry vainly attempted to refute the doctrine of the reſurrection, of thoſe enraged Nazarenes his fellow citizens who would have carried him by force to a precipice, that they might throw him down headlong, no names are ever mentioned; nor is the young but opulent magiſtrate named, who came to conſult him as to what he muſt do to obtain eternal life; for though there were ſome favourable ſymptoms in his caſe, yet as, by going away ſorrowful, he betrayed a heart wedded to the world, the application did not terminate to his honour. But of Simon the Phariſee, who invited our Lord to his houſe, and who, though doubtful, ſeemed inclinable to learn, of Jairus, and Bartimeus, and Zacheus, and Lazarus, and his ſiſters Mary and Martha, and ſome others, of whoſe faith, repentance, gratitude, love, and piety, the moſt honourable teſtimony is given, a very different account is made.

Some may object that this conduct in the firſt diſciples is imputable to a weak and timid policy. They were afraid to raiſe againſt themſelves powerful enemies, whoſe vengeance might prove fatal to their perſons, and ruinous to their cauſe. It happens luckily for ſilencing this pretext, that, in other things, they gave the moſt unequivocal proofs of their fortitude; beſides, that the exceptions above mentioned include almoſt all the perſons poſſeſſed of ſuch authority civil or ſacred, united with ſuch a diſpoſition, as could render their reſentment an object of terror to thoſe who were obnoxious to it. That the difference thus marked between the evil and the good is, on the contrary, in the true ſpirit of their Maſter, might be inferred, as from ſeveral other paſſages, ſo in particular, from that ſimilude wherein the rewards and puniſhments of another ſtate are ſo well exemplified. A name is given to the poor man who was conveyed by angels to Abraham's boſom: the other, who was conſigned to torments, is diſtinguiſhed ſolely by the epithet *rich*. A particularity from which we may learn an inſtructive leſſon of modeſty and caution in regard to names, when what truth compels us to ſay, is to the diſadvantage of the perſons, and that it ſufficeth that we conſider particular puniſhments as ſuited to particular actions, without referring them to known individuals, or leading the thoughts of others to refer them.

But as to the penmen themſelves, and their fellow-diſciples, in recording their own faults, no ſecret is made of the names. Of this the intemperate zeal of the ſons of Zebedee on one occaſion, and their ambition and ſecular views on another, the incredulity of Thomas, the preſumption of Peter, and his lamentable defection in the denial of his Maſter, not to mention the prejudices and dullneſs of them all, are eminent examples. Theſe particulars are all related, by the ſacred hiſtorians, with the ſame undiſguiſed plainneſs, which they uſe in relating the crimes of adverſaries: and with as little endeavour to extenuate the former, as to aggravate the latter. Nor have they, on the other hand, the remoteſt appearance of making a merit of their confeſſion. In one uniform ſtrain they record the moſt ſignal miracles, and the moſt ordinary events. In regard to the one, like perſons familiariſed to ſuch exertions of power, they no more expreſs themſelves either with heſitancy or with ſtrong aſſeverations, than they do in regard to the other. Equally certain of the facts advanced, they recite both in the ſame unvaried tone, as faithful witneſſes, whoſe buſineſs it was to teſtify, and not to argue.

§ 23. HENCE it happens that that quality of ſtyle which is called *animation*, is in a manner excluded from the narrative. The hiſtorians ſpeak of nothing, not even the moſt attrocious actions of our Lord's perſecutors, with ſymptoms of emotion; no angry epithet, or pathetic

pathetic exclamation, ever escapes them; not a word that betrays passion in the writer, or is calculated to excite the passions of the reader. In displaying the most gracious, as well as marvellous, dispensation of Providence towards man, all is directed to mend his heart, nothing to move his pity, or kindle his resentment. If these effects be also produced, they are manifestly the consequences of the naked exposition of the facts, and not of any adventitious art in the writers, nay not of any one term, not otherwise necessary, employed for the purpose.

I am sensible that to those who are both able and willing to give these writings a critical examination, hardly in any translation does this peculiarity appear so much as it does in the original. Most readers consider *animation* as an excellency in writing; and in ordinary performances it no doubt is so. By interesting them strongly in the events related, it rouses and quickens their attention. Unanimated simplicity, on the contrary, they call flatness, if not insipidity of manner. In consequence of this general sentiment, when two words occur to a translator, either of which expresses the fact, but one of them does it simply, without any note of either praise or blame, the other with some warmth expressive of censure or approbation; he very naturally prefers the latter as the more emphatical and affecting. Nor will he be apt to suspect that he is not sufficiently close to the original, if the action or thing alluded to be truly signified, though not entirely in the same manner. Such differences even good translators, though not insensible of them, are apt to overlook, excusing themselves with the consideration, that words in all respects corresponding in two tongues which differ widely from each other, are not always to be found.

But to explain myself by examples, without which a writer is often but indistinctly understood; in rendering ὁ παραδους αυτον * into Latin; of the two verbs, *tradere* to deliver up, and *prodere* to betray, most translators would prefer the latter as the more animated. Yet in reality, the former is more conformable to the simplicity of the sacred author, who satisfies himself with acquainting us with the external fact, without characterising it or insinuating his own opinion; otherwise the terms would have been προδους not παραδους. Again, the demonstrative ουτος * may be rendered into English either *this man* or *this fellow*. But in the last expression a degree of contempt is suggested, which is not in the first, nor in the original. See the notes on both passages.

§ 24. Let it be observed that in excluding animation, I in a great measure confine myself to the narrative, or what proceeds immediately from the historians. In the discourses and dialogues wherein their master bears the only, or the principal part; the expression, without losing aught of its proper simplicity, is often remarkable for spirit and energy. There is in these an animation, but so chastised by candour and strict propriety, as to be easily distinguished from what is often so termed in other compositions.

Yet here too, the language has sometimes suffered in the very best translations, and that not so much through the fault of translators, as in consequence of the difference of genius found in different tongues. Some of the epithets employed by our Lord against his antagonists, have not that asperity which all modern versions appear to give them. The Greek word υποκριτης, for example, as metaphorically used in Scripture, has more latitude of signification than the word *hypocrite* formed from it, as used in modern tongues. The former is alike applicable to all who dissemble on any subject or occasion; the latter is in strictness applied only to those who, in what concerns religion, lead a life of dissimulation. It must be owned that it is to persons of this character, that it is oftenest applied in the Gospel; but the judicious philologist hardly needs to be informed, that the more the signification of a word is extended, the more vague and general it becomes, and consequently, if a reproachful epithet, the softer. The word ψευστης in like manner, has not that harshness in Greek that *liar* has in English. The reason is the same as in the former instance: for though often properly rendered *liar*, it is not limited to what we mean by that term. Every man who tells or teaches what is false, whether he know the falsehood of what he says or not, is what the sacred authors justly denominate ψευστης, *a false speaker*; but he is not what we call *a liar*, unless he knows it to be false, and deceives intentionally. For this reason I have, in some instances †, considered it as no more than doing justice to the spirit of the original, to soften the expression in the common version, though otherwise unexceptionable.

On the other hand, the Evangelists, in their own characters, are rarely other than mere narrators, without passions or opinions. In this, as I have said, they differ from Moses and the other historians of the Old Testament, who, though justly celebrated for native simplicity of manner, have not hesitated briefly to characterise the most remarkable persons and actions whereof they have occasion to speak. Without pretending to account entirely for this difference of manner, in writers who spoke by the same Spirit, I shall only submit to the judicious reader the following conderations, which appear to indicate a singular pro-

* Matth. x. 4. † Matth. xii. 24. ‡ Matth. xxii. 18. Jo. viii. 55.

priety in the modeſt reſerve of our Lord's biographers.

Moſes and the other writers of the Old Teſtament Scriptures were all prophets, a character with which, conſidered in a religious light, no merely human character can be compared. None therefore could be better authorized than they, to pronounce directly, on the quality both of the agents and of the actions mentioned in their hiſtories. In this view of the matter, they had no ſuperior, even in the moſt eminent perſonages whoſe lives they recorded. An unreſerved plainneſs of cenſure or approbation was in them therefore becoming, as it entirely ſuited the authority with which they were veſted. But was not the ſituation of the Evangeliſts, it may be aſked, the ſame in this reſpect, as they alſo wrote by inſpiration? It is true, they were inſpired, and at leaſt equally entitled to the prophetical character with any who preceded them; but they were not entirely in the ſame ſituation. In the Old Teſtament, the ſacred penmen were the mouth of God to the people. In the goſpels, the writers appear ſolely as Chriſt's humble attendants, ſelected for introducing to the knowledge of others, this infinitely higher character, who is himſelf in a ſuper-eminent ſenſe the mouth, the oracle of God. It is this ſubordinate part of uſhers which they profeſſedly act. Like people ſtruck with the ineffable dignity of the Meſſiah whom they ſerve, they loſe no opportunity of exhibiting him to the world, appearing to conſider the introduction of their own opinion, unleſs where it makes a part of the narration, as an impertinence. As modeſt pupils in the preſence of ſo venerable a teacher, they lay their hand upon their mouth, and by a reſpectful ſilence, ſhow how profound their reverence is, and how ſtrong their deſire to fix all the attention of mankind upon him. They ſink themſelves, in order to place him in the moſt conſpicuous point of view: they do more; they, as it were, annihilate themſelves, that Jeſus may be all in all. Never could it be ſaid of any preachers, with more truth than of them, that they preached not themſelves, but Chriſt Jeſus the Lord. Deeply impreſſed with their Maſter's inſtructions, and far from affecting to be called Rabbi, or to be honoured of men as fathers and teachers in things divine, they never allowed themſelves to forget that they had only one father who is in heaven, and only one teacher the Meſſiah. The unimpaſſioned, yet not unfeeling manner, wherein they relate his cruel ſufferings, without letting one harſh or ſevere epithet eſcape them, reflecting on the conduct of his enemies, is as unexampled as it is inimitable, and forms an eſſential diſtinction between them and all who have either gone before or followed them, literate or illiterate, artful or artleſs, ſceptical or fanatical. For if, in the latter claſſes, the illiterate, the artleſs, and the fanatical, fury and hatred flame forth, wherever oppoſition or contradiction preſents them with an occaſion; the former, the literate, the artful, and the ſceptical, are not leſs diſtinguiſhable for the ſupercilious and contemptuous manner, in which they treat the opinions of religioniſts of all denominations. The manner of the Evangeliſts was equally removed from both. Add to this, that without making the leaſt pretences to learning, they no where affect to depreciate it; but, on the contrary, ſhew a readineſs to pay all due regard to every uſeful talent or acquiſition.

§ 25. From all that has been ſaid I cannot help concluding that, if theſe men were impoſtors, agreeably to the infidel hypotheſis, they were the moſt extraordinary the world ever produced. That they were not philoſophers and men of ſcience, we have irrefragable, I had almoſt ſaid, intuitive evidence; and of what has hitherto been found invariably to mark the character of fanatics and enthuſiaſts of all religions, we do not diſcover in them a ſingle trace. Their narratives demonſtrate them to have been men of ſound minds and cool reflection. To ſuppoſe them deceived in matters which were the objects of their ſenſes; or, if not deceived, to ſuppoſe ſuch men to have planned the deception of the world, and to have taken the method which they took, to execute their plan; are alike attended with difficulties inſurmountable. The Chriſtian's hypotheſis, that they ſpoke the truth, and were under the influence of the divine Spirit, removes at once all difficulties, and in my judgment (for I have long and often revolved the ſubject), is the only hypotheſis which ever will, or ever can, remove them. But this only by the way.

§ 26. Concerning the other qualities of ſtyle to be found in theſe writings, I acknowledge, I have not much to add. Simplicity, gravity, and perſpicuity, as neceſſarily reſulting from ſimplicity, are certainly their predominant characters. But as in writings it is not always eaſy to diſtinguiſh the qualities ariſing from the thought, from thoſe ariſing merely from the expreſſion; I ſhall conſider, in a few ſentences, how far the other properties of good writing, commonly attributed to the ſtyle, are applicable to the Evangeliſts. In what concerns harmony, and qualities which may be called merely ſuperficial, as adding only an external poliſh to their language; about ſuch, if we may judge from their writings, they do not appear, as was hinted before, to have had any the ſmalleſt ſolicitude. To convey the ſenſe (the only thing of importance enough to be an object to them) in the moſt familiar, and conſequently in the moſt intelligible, terms to their readers, ſeems to have been their higheſt aim in point of ſtyle. What concerned the ſound alone, and not the ſenſe, was unworthy of their attention.

In regard to elegance, there is an elegance which reſults from the uſe of ſuch words as are moſt in favour with thoſe who are accounted fine writers, and from

from such an arrangement in the words and clauses, as has generally obtained their approbation. This is still of the nature of *varnish*, and is disclaimed, not studied by the sacred authors. But there is also an elegance of a superior order, more nearly connected with the sentiment; and in this sort of elegance they are not deficient. In all the Oriental languages great use is made of tropes, especially metaphor. The Scriptures abound with them. When the metaphors employed bear a strong resemblance, and the other tropes are happily adapted to the subjects they are intended to represent, they confer *vivacity* on the writing. If they be borrowed from objects which are naturally agreeable, beautiful, or attractive, they add also *elegance*. Now of this kind, both of *vivacity* and of *elegance*, the Evangelists furnish us with a variety of examples. Our Lord illustrates every thing (agreeably to the use of the age and country) by figures and similies. His tropes are always apposite; and often borrowed from objects naturally engaging. The former quality renders them *lively*, and the latter *elegant*. The ideas introduced are frequently those of cornfields, vineyards, and gardens. The parables are sometimes indeed taken from the customs of princes and grandees, but oftener from the life of shepherds and and husbandmen. If those of the first kind confer dignity on the examples, those of the second add an attraction, from the pleasantness of images which recal to the fancy, the thoughts of rural happiness and tranquillity. And even in cases where propriety required that things disagreeable should be introduced, as in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, the whole is conducted with that seriousness, and chaste simplicity of manner, which totally exclude disgust. We may justly say, therefore, that the essential attributes of good writing are not wanting in these histories, though whatever can be considered as calculated for glitter and ostentation, is rather avoided than sought.

§ 27. Upon the whole, therefore, the qualities of the style could not, to those who were not Jews, nor accustomed to their idiom, serve at first to recommend these writings. The phraseology could hardly fail to appear to such, awkward, idiomatical, and even vulgar. In this manner it generally did appear to gentile Greeks upon the first perusal. But if they were by any means, induced to give them a second reading, though still not insensible of the peculiarity, their prejudices and dislike of the idiom rarely failed to subside. A third commonly produced an attachment. The more they became acquainted with these books, the more they discovered of a charm in them, to which they found nothing comparable or similar in all that the had learnt before, insomuch that they were not ashamed, nay, they were proud, to be taught by writers, for whose persons and performances, they had formerly entertained a sovereign contempt. The persecutors of the church, both Jews and Pagans, perceived, at last, the consequences of conniving at the study of the Scriptures, and were therefore determined, to make it their principal object, to effect the suppression of them, particularly of the Gospels. But the more this was attempted, the more were the copies multiplied, the more was the curiosity of mankind excited, and the more was the inestimable treasure of divine knowledge they contained, circulated. Early, and with avidity, were translations demanded, in almost every known tongue. Those Christians who had as much learning as to be capable, were ambitious of contributing their share in diffusing amongst all nations, the delight as well as the instruction, which the study of these books conveyed into the soul. Nor was this admiration of the divine writings to be found only among the vulgar and the ignorant. It is true it originated among them; but it did not terminate with them. Contrary to the common course of fashion, which descends from the higher ranks to the lower, it arose amongst the lowest classes, and ascended to the highest. Not only nobles and senators, but even philosophers and men of letters, the pupils of sophists and rhetoricians, who by the prejudices of their education would be most shocked with the inelegancies, the vulgarisms, and even the barbarisms (as they would account them), of the sacred writers, found a secret and irresistible attraction, which overcame all their prepossessions, and compelled them to acknowledge, that no writers could so effectually convey conviction to the understanding, and reformation to the heart, as these poor, homely, artless, and unlettered Galileans.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION THE FOURTH.

Obſervations on the right Method of proceeding in the critical Examination of the Books of the New Teſtament.

IT was remarked, in a foregoing Diſſertation *, that, notwithſtanding the ſameneſs both of the language and of the idiom employed by the penmen of the New Teſtament, there is a ſenſible diverſity in their ſtyles. The firſt general rule, therefore, which demands the attention of him who would employ himſelf in ſearching the Scriptures, is to endeavour to get acquainted with each writer's ſtyle, and, as he proceeds in the examination, to obſerve his manner of compoſition, both in ſentences and in paragraphs, to remark the words and phraſes peculiar to him, and the peculiar application which he may ſometimes make of ordinary words; for there are few of thoſe writers who have not their peculiarities in all the reſpects now mentioned. This acquaintance with each can be attained only by the frequent and attentive reading of his works in his own language.

§ 2. THE ſecond general direction is to enquire carefully, as far as is compatible with the diſtance of time and the other diſadvantages we labour under, into the character, the ſituation, and the office of the writer, the time, the place, and the occaſion of his writing, and the people for whoſe immediate uſe he originally intended his work. Every one of theſe particulars will ſometimes ſerve to elucidate expreſſions otherwiſe obſcure or doubtful. This knowledge may in part be learnt from a diligent and reiterated peruſal of the book itſelf, and in part be gathered from what authentic, or at leaſt probable, accounts have been tranſmitted to us concerning the compilement of the canon.

§ 3. THE third and only other general direction I ſhall mention, is, to conſider the principal ſcope of the book, and the particulars chiefly obſervable in the method by which the writer has purpoſed to execute his deſign. This direction, I acknowledge, can hardly be conſidered as applicable to the hiſtorical books, whoſe purpoſe is obvious, and whoſe method is determined by the order of time, or at leaſt by the order in which the ſeveral occurrences recorded have preſented themſelves to the memory of the compiler. But in the epiſtolary writings, eſpecially thoſe of the Apoſtle Paul, this conſideration would deſerve particular attention.

§ 4. Now to come to rules of a more ſpecial nature. If, in reading a particular book, a word or phraſe occur, which appears obſcure, perhaps unintelligible, how ought we to proceed? The firſt thing undoubtedly we have to do, if ſatisfied that the reading is genuine, is to conſult the context, to attend to the manner wherein the term is introduced, whether in a chain of reaſoning, or as belonging to a hiſtorical narration, as conſtituting ſome circumſtance in a deſcription, or included in an exhortation or command. As the concluſion is inferred from the premiſes; or as from two or more known truths, a third unknown or unobſerved before may fairly be deduced; ſo from ſuch attention to the ſentences in connection, the import of an expreſſion, in itſelf obſcure or ambiguous, will ſometimes with moral certainty be diſcovered. This, however, will not always anſwer.

§ 5. IF it do not, let the ſecond conſideration be, whether the term or phraſe be any of the writer's peculiarities. If ſo, it comes naturally to be enquired, what is the acceptation in which he employs it in other places? If the ſenſe cannot be preciſely the ſame in the paſſage under review, perhaps, by an eaſy and natural metaphor or other trope, the common acceptation may give riſe to one which perfectly ſuits the paſſage in queſtion. Recourſe to the other places wherein the word or phraſe occurs in the ſame author, is of conſiderable uſe, though the term ſhould not be peculiar to him.

§ 6. BUT thirdly, if there ſhould be nothing in the ſame writer that can enlighten the place, let recourſe be had to the parallel paſſages, if there be any ſuch, in the other ſacred writers. By parallel paſſages I mean thoſe places, if the difficulty occur in hiſtory, wherein the ſame or a ſimilar ſtory, miracle, or event, is related; if in teaching or reaſoning, thoſe parts wherein the ſame doctrine or argument is treated, or the ſame parable pro-

* Diſſertat. I. Part II. § 1

propounded; and if in moral leſſons, thoſe wherein the ſame claſs of duties is recommended. Or, if the difficulty be found in a quotation from the Old Teſtament, let the parallel paſſage in the book referred to, both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek verſion, be conſulted.

§ 7. But if in theſe there be found nothing that can throw light on the expreſſion, of which we are in doubt; the fourth recourſe is to all the places wherein the word or phraſe occurs in the New Teſtament, and in the Septuagint verſion of the Old, adding to theſe the conſideration of the import of the Hebrew or Chaldaic word whoſe place it occupies, and the extent of ſignification, of which in different occurrences ſuch Hebrew or Chaldaic term is ſuſceptible.

§ 8. Perhaps the term in queſtion is one of thoſe which very rarely occur in the New Teſtament, or thoſe called ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, only once read in Scripture, and not found at all in the tranſlation of the Seventy. Several ſuch words there are. There is then a neceſſity, in the fifth place, for recurring to the ordinary acceptation of the term in claſſical authors. This is one of thoſe caſes wherein the interpretation given by the earlieſt Greek fathers deſerves particular notice. In this verdict, however, I limit myſelf to thoſe comments wherein they give a literal expoſition of the ſacred text, and do not run, as is but too cuſtomary with them, into viſion and allegory. There are ſo many advantages which people have for diſcovering the import of a term or phraſe in their mother-tongue, unuſual perhaps in writing, but current in converſation, above thoſe who ſtudy a dead language, ſolely by means of the books extant in it, that no reaſonable perſon can queſtion that ſome deference is in ſuch caſes due to their authority.

Ye will obſerve, that in regard to the words or phraſes, whereof an illuſtration may be had from other parts of ſacred writ, whether of the Old or of the New Teſtament, I ſhould not think it neceſſary to recur directly to thoſe primitive, any more than to our modern, expounders. My reaſon is, as the word or phraſe may not improbably be affected by the idiom of the ſynagogue, the Jewiſh literature will be of more importance than the Grecian, for throwing light upon the paſſage. Now this is a kind of learning with which the Greek fathers were very little acquainted. Whereas, on the other hand, if the term in queſtion rarely, or but once, occur in the New Teſtament, and never in the verſion of the Old, there is little ground to imagine that it is affected by the idiom of the ſynagogue, but the greateſt reaſon to ſuppoſe that it is adopted by the ſacred penmen in the common acceptation.

I think it neceſſary to add here another limitation to the reference intended to the ancient Greek expoſitors. If the doubtful paſſage have been produced in ſupport of a ſide, in any of the famous controverſies by which the Chriſtian church has been divided; no regard is due to the authority whatever may be due to the arguments, of any writer, who lived at, or ſoon after, the time when the controverſy was agitated. If you know the ſide he took in the diſpute, you are ſure beforehand of the explanation he will give of the words in queſtion. Nothing blinds the underſtanding more effectually than the ſpirit of party, and no kind of party-ſpirit more than bigotry under the aſſumed character of religious zeal.

§ 9. In regard to the uſe to be made of the Fathers for aſſiſting us to underſtand the Scriptures, there are two extremes, to one or other of which the much greater part of Chriſtians ſhow a propenſity. One is an implicit deference to their judgment in every point on which they have given an opinion, the other is no regard at all to any thing advanced by them. To the firſt extreme the more moderate Romaniſts, and thoſe Proteſtants who favour pompous ceremonies and an ariſtocratical hierarchy, are moſt inclined; and to the ſecond, thoſe Proteſtants, on the contrary, who prefer ſimplicity of worſhip and the democratical form in church government. But theſe obſervations admit many exceptions. As to the Papiſts, in the worſt ſenſe of the word, thoſe who are for ſupporting even the moſt exorbitant of the papal claims, the manifeſt tendency whereof is to eſtabliſh an eccleſiaſtical deſpotiſm, the aim of their doctrine, in ſpite of the canons, has long been to leſſen, as much as poſſible, our reverence of the Fathers. What was ſaid by Friar Theatin an Italian, in a public diſputation at Paris with ſome French divines, in preſence of the Pope's nuncio and many prelates, may be juſtly conſidered as ſpoken in the ſpirit, and expreſſive of the ſentiments, of the whole party. When his antagoniſt Baron a Dominican, urged the teſtimonies of ſeveral Fathers, in direct oppoſition to the doctrine maintained by the Italian, the latter did not recur to the chimerical diſtinctions of the Sorboniſts, but making light of that long train of authorities, replied contemptuouſly, "As to what concerns the au-" thority of the Fathers, I have only to ſay with the " church, *Omnes ſancti patres orate pro nobis*;" an anſwer which, at the ſame time that it greatly ſcandalized the Galican doctors, was highly approved by the Nuncio, well knowing that it would be very much reliſhed at Rome. So ſimilar on this head are the ſentiments of the moſt oppoſite ſects. Nor is this the only inſtance wherein the extremes approach nearer to each other, than the middle does to either. I may add that an unbounded reſpect for the Fathers was, till the commencement

mencement of the ſixteenth century, the prevalent ſentiment in Chriſtendom. Since that time their authority has declined apace, and is at preſent, in many places totally annihilated.

I own that, in my opinion, they of former generations were in one extreme, and we of the preſent are in another. The fathers are not entitled to our adoration, neither do they merit our contempt. If ſome of them were weak and credulous, others of them were both learned and judicious. In what depends purely on reaſon and argument, we ought to treat them with the ſame impartiality we do the moderns, carefully weighing what is ſaid, not who ſays it. In what depends on teſtimony, they are, in every caſe wherein no particular paſſion can be ſuſpected to have ſwayed them, to be preferred before modern interpreters or annotators. I ſay not this to inſinuate that we can rely more on their integrity, but to ſignify that many points were with them a ſubject of teſtimony, which, with modern critics, are matter merely of conjecture, or at moſt of abſtruſe and critical diſcuſſion. It is only from ancient authors, that thoſe ancient uſages, in other things as well as in language, can be diſcovered by us, which to them ſtood on the footing of matters of fact, whereof they could not be ignorant. Language, as has been often obſerved, is founded in uſe; and ancient uſe, like all other ancient facts, can be conveyed to us only by written teſtimony. Beſides, the facts, regarding the import of words (when controverſy is out of the queſtion) do not, like other facts, give ſcope to the paſſions to operate; and if miſrepreſented, they expoſe either the ignorance or the bad faith of the author to his contemporaries. I do not ſay, therefore, that we ought to confide in the verdict of the fathers as judges, but that we ought to give them an impartial hearing as, in many caſes, the only competent witneſſes. And every body muſt be ſenſible that the direct teſtimony of a plain man, in a matter which comes within the ſphere of his knowledge, is more to be regarded, than the ſubtile conjectures of an able ſcholar who does not ſpeak from knowledge, but gives the concluſions he has drawn from his own precarious reaſonings, or from thoſe of others.

§ 10. And even as to what is advanced not on knowledge but on opinion, I do not think that the moderns are in general entitled to the preference. On controverted articles of faith, both ought to be conſulted with caution, as perſons who may reaſonably be thought prejudiced in favour of the tenets of their party. If, in this reſpect, there be a difference, it is entirely in favour of the ancients. An increaſe of years has brought to the church an increaſe of controverſies. Diſputes have multiplied, and been dogmatically decided. The conſequence whereof is, that religion was not near ſo much moulded into the ſyſtematic form for many centuries, as it is in theſe latter ages. Every point was not in ancient times ſo minutely diſcuſſed, and every thing, even to the phraſeology, ſettled in the ſeveral ſects, with ſo much hypercritical and metaphyſical, not to ſay ſophiſtical, ſubtlety, as at preſent. They were, therefore, if not entirely free, much leſs entangled with deciſions merely human, than more recent commentators; too many of whom ſeem to have had it for their principal object, to bring the language of Scripture to as cloſe a conformity, as poſſible, to their own ſtandard, and make it ſpeak the dialect of their ſect. So much for the preference I give to the ancient, particularly to the Greek, expounders of Scripture, when they confine themſelves to the grammatical ſenſe; and ſo much for the regard to which I think the early Chriſtian writers juſtly entitled.

§ 11. To the aid we may have from them, I add that of the ancient verſions, and the laſt of all that of modern ſcholiaſts, annotators, and tranſlators. In the choice of theſe we ought to be more influenced by the acknowledged learning, diſcernment, and candour of the perſon, than by the religious denomination to which he belonged, or the ſide which, on conteſted articles, he moſt favoured. So far from limiting ourſelves to thoſe of one ſect, or of one ſet of tenets, it is only by the free uſe of the criticiſms and arguments of oppoſite ſides, as urged by themſelves, that undue prepoſſeſſions are beſt cured, or even prevented. We have heard of poiſons which ſerve as antidotes againſt other poiſons of oppoſite quality. It will be no inconvenient conſequence of the uſe of interpreters addicted to adverſe parties, if their exceſſes ſerve mutually to correct one another.

§ 12. But I am aware that ſome will be aſtoniſhed that, among the aſſiſtances enumerated for interpreting the Scriptures, I have made no mention of two helps much celebrated by writers of almoſt all denominations. Theſe are *the analogy of the faith*, and *the etymology of the words*. It will no donbt be proper now to enquire impartially, what aid, in the interpretation of dark and doubtful paſſages, may reaſonably be ſought for and expected from theſe.

§ 13. First, of the analogy of the faith: As far as I can collect from the import of the terms, what is meant by propoſing this as a rule of interpretation in every dubious caſe, it ſhould be, that when a paſſage appears ambiguous, or is ſuſceptible of different interpretations, that interpretation is always to be adopted which is moſt conformable to the whole ſcheme of religion, in reſpect both of doctrines and of precepts, delivered in the ſacred oracles. Now, there can be no queſtion that, if the enquirer be previouſly in the certain knowledge of that whole ſcheme, this

rule is excellent, and, in a great measure, superſedes the neceſſity of any other. But let me aſk him, or rather let him aſk himſelf, ere he proceed, this ſimple queſtion, What is the reaſon, the principal reaſon at leaſt, for which the ſtudy of Scripture is ſo indiſpenſible a duty? It is preciſely, all conſiſtent Proteſtants will anſwer, that thence we may diſcover what the whole ſcheme of religion is. Are we then to begin our examination with taking it for granted that, without any enquiry, we are perfectly acquainted with this ſcheme already? Is not this going to Scripture, not in order to learn the truths it contains, but in order to find ſomething that may be made to ratify our own opinions?

If no more were meant by making the analogy of the faith the rule of interpreting, than that, where an expreſſion is either dark or equivocal, an interpretation were not to be adopted, which would contradict the ſentiments of the writer, manifeſtly declared in other paſſages perfectly clear and unequivocal; this is no more than what candour would allow in interpreting any profane author, who ſeems to have enjoyed the exerciſe of his reaſon; nay, though the rule were extended to what ſhould be found clearly contained in any other ſacred writer, it would be but of little ſignificance as an help in the explanation of the holy oracles. For it is only the uncontroverted truths, about which there has never ariſen any doubt in the church, that ought to be comprehended in the phraſe *the analogy of the faith*, when propoſed in this manner as a canon to direct us in the interpretation of Scripture.

'But why,' ſay you, 'ſhould we confine the meaning to the uncontroverted truths?' Attend a little, and you muſt perceive that what I have now advanced, is almoſt ſelf-evident. When I recur to holy writ, my view is, or ought to be, that I may know what it teaches; more eſpecially that, as its doctrine is ſo variouſly repreſented by different ſects, I may thence diſcover, amid ſuch a multiplicity of jarring ſentiments, where the truth lies. My purpoſe manifeſtly is, by the Scripture, to judge concerning all ſuch controverted ſentiments, and not, by a particular ſet of controverted ſentiments, previouſly and therefore inconſiderately adopted, to determine concerning the ſenſe of Scripture. This would not be judging the parties by the law, but reſolving to judge of the import of the law by the interpretation that ſhall be given by one of the parties, whom we have contracted a ſtrong inclination to favour. Surely ſuch a conduct in a civil judge would be univerſally pronounced incompatible with every principle of reaſon and juſtice. And is not at leaſt as great a deference due from the devout Chriſtian to the divine oracles, as is due from the ſecular judge to the law of his country?

§. 14. In vain do we ſearch the Scriptures for their teſtimony concering Chriſt, if independently of theſe Scriptures, we have received a teſtimony from another quarter, and are determined to admit nothing, as the teſtimony of Scripture, which will not perfectly quadrate with that formerly received. This was the ſource of blindneſs of the Jews in our Saviour's time. They ſearched the Scriptures as much as we do; but, in the diſpoſition they were in, they would never have diſcovered what that ſacred volume teſtifies of Chriſt*. Why? Becauſe their great rule of interpretation was *the analogy of the faith*; or, in other words, the ſyſtem of the Phariſean ſcribes, the doctrine then in vogue, and in the profound veneration of which they had been educated. This is that veil by which the underſtandings of that people were darkened, even in reading the law, and of which the Apoſtle obſerved that it remained unremoved in his day, and of which we ourſelves have occaſion to obſerve that it remains unremoved in ours.

And it is not preciſely in the ſame way that the phraſe is uſed by every ſect of Chriſtians, for the particular ſyſtem or digeſt of tenets for which they themſelves have the greateſt reverence? The Latin church, and even the the Greeek, are explicit in their declarations on this article. With each *the analogy of the faith* is their own ſyſtem alone. And that different parties of Proteſtants, though more reſerved in their manner of ſpeaking, aim at the ſame thing, is undeniable: the ſame, I mean, conſidered relatively to the ſpeakers; for abſolutely conſidered, every party means a different thing. When a Lutheran tells you, "You are to put no interpretation on any portion of Scripture, but what "perfectly coincides with *the analogy of the faith*;" liſten him ever ſo little on the import of this phraſe, and you ſhall find that, if he mean any thing, it is, that you are to admit no expoſition that will not exactly tally with the ſyſtem of his great founder Luther. Nor is he ſingular in this. A Calviniſt has the ſame prepoſſeſſion in favour of the ſcheme of Calvin, and an Arminian of that of Arminius. Yet they will all tell you with one voice, that their reſpective doctrines are to be tried by Scripture, and by Scripture alone. *To the law and to the teſtimony*, is the common cry; only every one of them, the better to ſecure the deciſion on the ſide he has eſpouſed, would have you previouſly reſolve, to put no ſenſe whatever on the law and the teſtimony, but what his favourite doctor will admit. Thus they run on in a ſhuffling circular ſort of argument, which, though they ſtudiouſly avoid expoſing it, is, when dragged into the open light, neither more nor leſs than this: "You are to try our doctrine by the Scrip-"ture only. But then you are to be very careful that

* See John, v. 39, 40. in this Tranſlation, with the note upon it.

"you explain the Scripture ſolely by our doctrine." A wonderful plan of trial, which begins with giving judgment, and ends with examining the proof, wherein the whole ſkill and ingenuity of the judges are to be exerted in wreſting the evidence ſo as to give it the appearance of ſupporting the ſentence pronounced beforehand.

'But,' ſay ſome, 'is not this mode of interpretation 'warranted by apoſtolical authority? Does not 'Paul*, in ſpeaking of the exerciſe of the ſpi-'ritual gifts, enjoin the prophets to propheſy, 'κατα την αναλογιαν της πιστεως, *according to the proportion* 'of faith, as our tranſlators render it, but as ſome 'critics explain it, *according to the analogy of the* 'faith?' Though this expoſition has been admitted into ſome verſions†, and adopted by Hammond and other commentators, and may be called literal, it is ſuited neither to the ordinary meaning of the words, nor to the tenor of the context. The word αναλογια ſtrictly denotes proportion, meaſure, rate, but by no means that complex notion conveyed in the aforeſaid phraſe by the term *analogy*, which has been well obſerved by Whitby, to be particularly unſuitable in this place, where the Apoſtle treats of thoſe who ſpeak by inſpiration, not of thoſe who explain what has been thus ſpoken by others. The context manifeſtly leads us to underſtand αναλογια πιστεως, v 6. as equivalent to πιστιν πιστεως, v. 3. And for the better underſtanding of this phraſe, *the meaſure of faith*, it may be proper to obſerve, 1ſt, that a ſtrong conviction of any tenet, from whatever cauſe it ariſes, is in Scripture ſometimes termed *faith*. Thus, in the ſame Epiſtle‡, the Apoſtle ſays, *Haſt thou faith? Have it to thyſelf before God.* The ſcope of his reaſoning ſhows that nothing is there meant by *faith*, but a conviction of the truth, in regard to the article of which he had been treating, namely, the equality of days and meats, in point of ſanctity, under the goſpel diſpenſation. The ſame is evidently the meaning of the word, v. 23. *Whatſoever is not of faith, is ſin*; where, without regard to the morality of an action abſtractly conſidered, that is concluded to be ſin which is done by one who doubts of its lawfulneſs; 2dly, as to ſpiritual gifts, prophecy and inſpiration in particular, they appear to have been accompanied with ſuch a faith or conviction that they came from the Spirit, as left no room for heſitation. And indeed it is eaſy to perceive that ſomething of this kind was abſolutely neceſſary, to enable the inſpired perſon to diſtinguiſh what proceeded from the Spirit of God, from what was the creature of his own imagination. It was obſerved before§, that the prophets of God were not acted upon like machines, in delivering their predictions, as the diviners were ſuppoſed to be among the heathen, but had then, as a-tother times, the free uſe of their faculties both of body and mind. This caution is therefore with great propriety given them by the Apoſtle, to induce them to be attentive in propheſying not to exceed the preciſe meaſure allowed them, (for different meaſures of the ſame gift were committed to different perſons), and not to mingle aught of their own with the things of God's Spirit. This diſtinction, he tells them they have it in their power to make, by, means of that lively faith with which the divine illumination is accompanied. Though a ſenſe ſomewhat different has been given to the words by ſome ancient Greek expoſitors, none of them, as far as I remember, ſeems to have formed a conception of that ſenſe which, as was obſerved above, has been given by ſome moderns.

So much for what is commonly underſtood by *the analogy of the faith*, ſo unanimouſly recommended as a rule of interpretation, but ſo diſcordantly applied; and ſo much for the regard that is due to it.

§ 15. ANOTHER ordinary method of explaining is, by entering, on every occaſion, into a minute and nice examination of the etymology of the principal words employed in the ſentence. This, though generally carried to exceſs, neither proceeds from the like partial prepoſſeſſions as the former, nor is ſo hazardous in its conſequences. There are caſes wherein no reaſonable perſon can doubt, that the ſignification of a word may be fully aſcertained from the knowledge we have of the meaning of the etymon: for inſtance, in verbal nouns expreſſing the action ſignified by the verb, as κριμα *judgment*, from κρινειν *to judge*, or the actor as κριτης *a judge*, from the ſame root; in concretes from abſtracts, as αληθινος *true*, from αληθεια *truth*: or converſely, abſtracts from concretes, as δικαιοσυνη *juſtice*, from δικαιος *juſt*. In compoſitions alſo analogically formed, the ſenſe of the compound term may often be certainly known, by the import of the ſimple terms of which it is compoſed. Thus no man will heſitate a moment to pronounce from etymology, that φιληδονος muſt mean *a lover of pleaſure*, and φιλοθεος *a lover of God*; though theſe words occur but once in the New-Teſtament, and never in the Greek verſion of the Old. In matters ſo obvious, the bare knowledge of the rudiments of the language renders the mention of any rules, ſave

* Rom. xii. 6.

† Port Royal and Saci, though tranſlating from the Vulgate, which ſays, *ſecundum rationem fidei*, have rendered the clauſe *ſelon l'analogie et la regle de la foi*.

‡ Rom. xiv. 22.

ſave thoſe of grammar, unneceſſary, almoſt as much as for determining the import of the future tenſe of a verb from that of the preſent, or the ſignification of the paſſive voice from that of the active. There are inſtances, however, wherein the verb in the paſſive form undergoes an additional change of meaning, beſide what the analogy of the language requires.

§ 16. But there are a great many caſes wherein, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, the pedigree of the derivative or of the compound, cannot be deduced with equal clearneſs; and there are many caſes wherein, though its deſcent may be clearly traced, we ſhould err egregiouſly, if we were to fix its meaning from that of the primitive or root. As to the firſt, that we ſhould not haſtily decide concerning the import of an obſcure or unuſual term, from that of another better known, but of whoſe relation to the former we are uncertain, is indeed manifeſt. But even often, where the connexion is unqueſtionable, the ſenſe of the one does not aſcertain the ſignification of the other. It will not be improper to give a few illuſtrations of this doctrine, as I know nothing in which modern critics are more frequently miſled, than in their reaſonings from etymology. I ſhall exemplify this remark firſt in ſimple words, and afterwards in compound.

§ 17. The Greek word τραγικος, from τραγος *a goat*; if it occurred very ſeldom in Greek authors, and if in the few places where it occurred, the words in connection did not ſuffice for aſcertaining the ſenſe, and if the cuſtom which gave riſe to the common acceptation of that term had never been related by any ancient writer, nobody, by the aid of etymology, could have imagined the meaning to be that which we know certainly that it is. As much may be ſaid of the word κωμικος, from κωμη *a village*. By neither ſhould we have been led to think of poetry or any of its ſpecies. To the Greek word κωμικος the Latin *paganus* anſwers exactly in being ſimilarly derived from a primitive of the ſame ſignification. But it is very far from correſponding in ſenſe. Nor does it, in the uſe which ſoon became univerſal among Chriſtians, correſpond better with its etymon *pagus*. When Chriſtianity became very general throughout the empire, as all the churches were in the cities and great towns, where the biſhops had their reſidence, the Chriſtians found a convenience in living near their place of worſhip, which made them moſtly reſort to the cities or their ſuburbs. Thoſe who were attached to the ancient idolatry, not having the ſame motive for preferring the towns, and probably liking better, when Chriſtianity came to have the aſcendant, to aſſociate with one another, lived generally in the villages. Hence *villager* and *idolator* became ſynonymous. This ſenſe of the Latin *paganus* has paſſed into modern tongues. The Italians ſay *pagano*, the French *payen*, and the Engliſh *pagan*, to denote the ſame character. The Engliſh word *villain*, in low Latin *villanus*, a farmer, a villager, though nearly coinciding in etymology, has come gradually by uſe to ſignify a worthleſs unprincipled man. Thus the three words κωμικος in Greek, *paganus* in Latin, and *villain* in Engliſh, though evidently ſo conformable in etymology, that they ought all to denote the ſame thing, namely *villager*, have, for many ages, both loſt that ſignification, and acquired others in which they do not in the leaſt reſemble one another. If the uſe in theſe languages ſhould ever come to be very little known, and the hiſtory of the nations nearly loſt, we may form a gueſs at the abſurdities in explaining thoſe terms into which men would be miſled by etymology. קדשה *kedeſhah*, in Hebrew ſignifies *a harlot*, a word manifeſtly ſprung, according to the invariable rules of that language, from קדש *kadaſh*, *to ſanctify*. What could give riſe ſo ſtrange a deviation from the primitive meaning, it is perhaps now impoſſible to diſcover.

In proceſs of time, words in every tongue vary from their original import, in conſequence of the gradual influence of incidental cauſes, and the changes in manners and ſentiments which they occaſion. Hence the word זרה among the Hebrews, which denoted no more at firſt than a female ſtranger, came at laſt to ſignify a common proſtitute; and is almoſt always uſed in this ſenſe by Solomon in the book of Proverbs. The origin of this application may indeed be eaſily traced from their laws. The women of that occupation among them were all foreigners, no daughter of Iſrael being permitted to follow ſo infamous a profeſſion. It is an obſervation of Cicero, if I remember right, that the word *hoſtis* with them anciently meant *foreigner*, which, having been given at firſt, through delicacy, as a milder name for people with whom they were at war, became, through long-continued uſe, the proper appellation for *enemy*. By the like gradation doubtleſs among us, the word *knave*, from denoting ſervant, has degenerated into the ſign of a character diſtinguiſhed more for turpitude of manners, than for meanneſs of condition. It would not be ſo eaſy to divine how the word *beholden*, the paſſive participle of the verb *to behold*, came, from ſignifying *ſeen* or *perceived*, to denote *indebted*. Innumerable examples of this kind might be mentioned.

§ 18. But from ſimple words to proceed, as I propoſed, to compounds; were we to lay it down as a principle, that the combined meanings of the component parts will always give us the ſenſe of the compound, we ſhould conclude that the Greek word παμφαγος is equivalent to the Engliſh poetic word *omni-*

fic, to which it exactly corresponds in etymology; yet nothing can be more different in ſignification. The former is always adopted in a bad, the latter in a good ſenſe. Hardly any rule in the compoſition of Greek words hold more uniformly than that the adverb ευ gives the addition of a good quality to the word with which it is joined; yet the term ευηθης, which, if any faith were due to etymology, ſhould mean a virtuous and worthy man, denotes generally a *ſimpleton* or *fool*. The Greek word αυταρκεια exactly correſponds, in reſpect of the ſignification of its component parts, to the Engliſh word *ſelf-ſufficiency*: yet the former has a good meaning, and denotes *contentment*; the latter, except when applied to the Deity, has invariably a bad meaning, and ſignifies *arrogance*. Sometimes the ſenſe of one of the words in compoſition is totally loſt, the compound term being applied in a manner which excludes it. Thus the word οικοδομεω ought to ſignify *to build a houſe*, but it is not only conſtrued with ταφες *a ſepulchre* (which by metaphor may indeed be called a houſe, being the receptacle of the dead) but with θυσιαστηριον *altar*, χαρακωσεις *bulwark*, and ſeveral other terms which, in no ſenſe, proper or figurative, can be denominated *houſes*. Such anomalies, both in derivation and in compoſition, are to be found in all tongues, inſomuch that often etymology points to one meaning, and uſe to another. Were we to mind the indication of the former, the Engliſh word *always* ought to be rendered into Latin *omnimodo* and not *ſemper*; our verb *to vouch-ſafe* ſhould denote *to give one a protection*, *to inſure one's ſafety*, and not *to deign* or *condeſcend*. The inſeparable prepoſition *re* in Engliſh commonly denotes *again*, but to *reprove* is not *to prove again*, *to recommend* is not to *commend again*; nor does *to remark* mean *to mark again*. As little can theſe be explained by the aid of the adverb, *back*, like the verbs to *recall* and *to return*.

§ 19. In the above examples I have confined myſelf to terms whoſe meaning, though an exception from the rules of analogy, is incontrovertible; my principal object being to evince, to the ſatisfaction of every intelligent reader, that the ſenſe of words is often totally different from that to which the etymology points, and that conſequently in all the caſes wherein uſe cannot be diſcovered, and wherein the context does not neceſſarily fix the meaning, the conviction which ariſes from etymology alone is conſiderably inferior to that which ariſes either from uſe, or from the words immediately connected. But before I diſmiſs this topic, I ſhall offer ſome criticiſms on a few paſſages of the New Teſtament which may appear, on a ſuperficial view, more controvertible, in order to ſhow with how much caution we ought to proceed in rendering a compound word in one language, by one in another ſimilarly compounded; and that even though the original term be not, like thoſe above ſpecified, an exception, in reſpect of meaning, from the common rules of analogy.

The word διψυχος, uſed by the Apoſtle James, compounded of δις, ſignifying in compoſition *double* or *twice*, and ψυχη, *ſoul*, *mind*, *ſpirit*, could not, one would at firſt imagine, be more properly or literally rendered than by the ſimilar Engliſh compound *double minded*. But this, though in ſome ſenſe it may be called a literal verſion, is a miſtranſlation of the word, inaſmuch as it conveys a ſenſe entirely different. Yet the meaning of the original term is analogical: only there are different ways wherein the mind or ſoul may be charged with duplicity. One is, when it ſometimes leans to one opinion, ſometimes to the contrary; another is, when it ſecretly harbours paſſions and opinions the reverſe of thoſe which it openly profeſſes. No two meanings can be more different; the firſt is certainly the import of the Greek word, the ſecond of the Engliſh, which is juſtly explained by Johnſon, *deceitful*, *inſidious*. To recur to the paſſage itſelf *; Ανηρ διψυχος ακαταστατος εν πασαις ταις οδοις αυτου, in the common tranſlation, *A double minded man is unſtable in all his ways*: firſt, the ſentiment itſelf may ſuggeſt a doubt of the juſtneſs of the verſion. There appears no immediate connection between deceitfulneſs and inconſtancy. The deceitful are often but too ſtable in a bad courſe. The doubleneſs expreſſed in the Engliſh word does not imply ſudden changes of any kind; but ſolely that the real motives of conduct and the outward profeſſions diſagree? or that the perſon intends one thing, whilſt he profeſſes another. Now who ſees not that, in reſpect of both the intention and the profeſſion, he may be very ſteady? Fickleneſs is not remarkably an attendant on hypocriſy. When I examine the context, I find nothing there that relates to the ſincerity or the conformity that ought to ſubſiſt between a man's words and his thoughts; but I am led directly by it to think of conſtancy in right principles, as the Apoſtle had been, in the preceding words, urging the neceſſity of unſhaken faith. This verſe, if διψυχος be underſtood to mean unſteady in the belief of the truth, perfectly coincides with, and ſupports, the Apoſtle's argument, implying that inconſtancy in principles produces inconſtancy in the whole conduct, than which no ſentiment can be clearer.

To recur, however, to ſome of the other rules of criticiſing above mentioned (not as neceſſary in the preſent inſtance, but for the ſake of illuſtration) and firſt to Scriptural uſage; I find, on enquiry, that there is only one other paſſage in the New Teſtament where-in the word occurs. It is in the ſame Epiſtle, but the expreſſion

* James, i, 8.

expreſſion there is too general to aſcertain the import of the term in queſtion. As the word is not to be found in the Septuagint, nor even in the Apocrypha, there is reaſon to believe that it is not affected by the idiom of the ſynagogue. I therefore apply to common uſe, and find that the word uniformly denotes *doubtful, fluctuating* in reſpect of one's judgment. All its conjugates in like manner ſupport this meaning; διψυχια is *doubt* or *heſitancy*, διψυχεω *to doubt, to heſitate*. If we apply to the ancient Greek expoſitors, they all interpret it in the ſame way. And as this is none of the paſſages whereon any of their theological controverſies were founded, we can give them the greater credit. I ſhall only tranſcribe the explanation given by Ecumenius*, which is to this effect: "Διψυχος ανηρ "is a man of unſettled and fluctuating ſentiments, too "ſolicitous about the preſent to attain the future, too "anxious about the future to ſecure the preſent, who "driven hither and thither in his judgment of things, "is perpetually ſhifting the object, who this moment "would ſacrifice all for eternity, and the next would "renounce any thing for this tranſient life." The ſenſe of the Apoſtle's expreſſion may be therefore juſtly given in theſe words: *A man unſteady in his opinions, is in all his actions inconſtant.*

§ 20. To the above example I ſhall add a few of the moſt common of all kinds of compoſition, a prepoſition and a verb in familiar uſe. My intention is chiefly to ſhow, that a deviation in interpreting, ſmall to appearance, even ſuch as is apt to be overlooked by a reader deceived by the correſpondence of the themes, is often ſufficient to pervert the ſenſe, either by rendering the expreſſion totally unmeaning, or by giving it a wrong meaning. The verb ὁραω, *to ſee*, is common; προ in compoſition generally anſwers to the Engliſh inſeparable prepoſition *fore*. The verb, therefore, προοραω, or, in the middle voice, προοραομαι, ſhould mean analogically, one would imagine, *to foreſee*. It is accordingly in one place ſo† rendered, *I foreſaw the Lord always before my face*, in Greek, προωρωμην τον Κυριον ενωπιον μου δια παντος. The words are a quotation from the Pſalms‡, and are literally copied from the Septuagint.

It will naturally occur to an attentive Engliſh reader to enquire, What is the meaning of the word *foreſaw* in this paſſage? Foreſight has a reference to the future; whereas the Pſalmiſt is ſpeaking of things at preſent: for, though it is true that the words relate to the Meſſiah, who was many centuries poſterior to David, they are not announced in the form of a prediction. David, in ſpeaking, perſonates the Meſſiah, of whom he was an eminent type, and aſcribes as to himſelf what, in the ſublimeſt ſenſe, was applicable only to that illuſtrious deſcendant. It is as it were Chriſt who ſpeaks. The Lord he repreſents as always before, not as *to be* in ſome future period before him, adding *he is*, not *he will be*, on my right hand. In regard to the compound verb, it occurs only in one other paſſage of the New Teſtament, to be conſidered afterwards, and in no place of the Septuagint, except that above quoted. But, on examining more cloſely the import of the ſimple words, we diſcover that the Greek prepoſition may relate to place as well as time, and that it is often merely what grammarians call *intenſive*: that is, it does not alter the ſenſe of the ſimple verb to which it is prefixed, it only renders the expreſſion more emphatical. Thus the verb προοραω is as literally rendered *proſpicio* as *prævideo*, and has been in this paſſage more fitly rendered ſo by Beza. It may be objected that this explanation produces a pleonaſm in the ſentence, as it is immediately added, ενωπιον μου, *before me*. But ſuch pleonaſms are not uncommon in Scripture. Thus § Το πνευμα υπερευτυγχανει υπερ ἡμων. ‖ Ὁστις οικοδομησει την οικιαν αυτου. ¶ Φωνην εκραξε κιθαρωδων κιθαριζοντων εν ταις κιθαραις αυτων. The laſt four words in this verſe are plainly implied in the participle. The phraſe which occurs oftener than once, επορευθη επ' αυτον, is chargeable with the like redundancy. Add to all this, that the Hebrew word here tranſlated προοραω by the Seventy, never ſignifies *to foreſee*, but *to place, to ſet*. In this paſſage, being applied to the mind, it denotes the Pſalmiſt's, or rather the Meſſiah's fixed attention on God as always with him.

The other paſſage in which this verb occurs is alſo in the Acts**, Ησαν προεωρακοτες Τροφιμον τον Εφεσιον εν τη πολει συν αυτω. Here the connection, without other reſource, ſhows ſufficiently that the ſimple verb ὁραω means literally *to ſee*, and the prepoſition προ *before*, in reſpect of time, not of place, and yet that προοραω does not imply *to foreſee*, but *to ſee before*. The difference lies here. The former is to ſee or perceive an event before it happen, the latter denotes only to ſee either perſon or thing before the preſent time, which alone can be the ſenſe of this paſſage, and which is therefore rightly rendered by our tranſlators, "*They had ſeen before with him, in the city, Trophimus an Epheſian.*" To have ſaid, "*They had foreſeen with him,*" would have totally marred the ſenſe. But our tranſlators have not always been equally attentive.

§ 21. I

* Διψυχον ανδρα, τον αμετεωρευτον, τον ασυμπικτον λεγει, τον μητε προς τα μελλοντα παγιως, μητε προς τα παροντα ασφαλως ἑδραζομενον, αλλα ταις κακειθεν αγομενον και περιφερομενον, και ποτε μεν των μελλοντων, ποτε δε των παροντων αντεχομενον.

† Acts, ii. 25. ‡ xvi. 8. § Rom. viii. 26.

‖ Matth. vii. 24. 26. ¶ Rev. xiv. 2. ** xxi. 29.

§ 21. I SHALL add an example, not unlike the former, in the verb προγινωσκω, though the difficulty, with regard to it, ariſes as much from the ſignification of the ſimple verb, as from that of the prepoſition. Paul ſays* Ουκ απωσατο ὁ Θεος τον λαον αὐτου ὁν προεγνω, which our tranſlators render, *God hath not caſt away his people which he foreknew.* The laſt clauſe in this verſion conveys to my mind no meaning whatever. To *foreknow* always ſignifies to know ſome event before it happen; but no event is here mentioned, ſo that we are at a loſs to diſcover the object of the foreknowledge mentioned. Is it only the exiſtence of the people? Even this is not explicitly ſaid; but if this were the writer's intention, we ſhould ſtill be at a loſs for the ſenſe. There is nothing in this circumſtance, which diſtinguiſhes God's people from any other people, for the exiſtence of all were equally foreknown by him: whereas here ſomething peculiar is plainly intended, which is ſuggeſted as a reaſon to prevent our thinking that God would ever totally caſt them away. Though nothing, to appearance, can anſwer more exactly than the Engliſh *foreknew*, does to the Greek προεγνω, it in reality labours under a double defect. The firſt is the ſame which was obſerved in the preceding paragraph, in rendering the prepoſition; for there is the ſame difference between *knowing before* and *foreknowing*, that there is between *ſeeing before* and *foreſeeing*. Our tranſlators have, on ſome occaſions, ſhown themſelves ſenſible of the difference. Accordingly they render προγινωσκοντες με απωθεν†, *which knew me from the beginning*, not *foreknew me*. The example above quoted from the twenty-firſt chapter of the Acts, is a ſimilar inſtance.

The prepoſitions in the two languages, though nearly, are not perfectly, correſpondent, eſpecially in compoſition. With us the inſeparable prepoſition *fore*, prefixed to *know*, *ſee*, *tell*, and *ſhow*, always relates to ſome event, which is *known*, *ſeen*, *told*, and *ſhown* before it happen: whereas the Greek prepoſition προ does not neceſſarily relate to an event, and ſignifies no more than *before this time*. The difference in theſe idioms may be thus illuſtrated. A friend introducing a perſon with whom he ſuppoſes me unacquainted, ſays, *This is ſuch a man.* I make anſwer, *I knew him before.* I ſhould ſpeak nonſenſe, if I ſaid, *I foreknew him.* Yet in Greek I might ſay properly προεγνων.

Another inſtance wherein our interpreters have ſhown an attention to this diſtinction, we have in the Second Epiſtle to the Corinthians‡, where they tranſlate the word προειρηκα very properly, *I have ſaid before.* Every reader of diſcernment muſt perceive that it would have been abſurd to render it in that place, *I have foretold.*

But to return to the paſſage under review in the Epiſtle to the Romans: it was obſerved, that the common verſion of the word προεγνω, in that paſſage, labours under a double defect. It is not, in my judgment, barely in tranſlating the prepoſition that the error lies, but alſo in the ſenſe aſſigned to the verb compounded with it. That God knew Iſrael before, in the ordinary meaning of the word *knowing*, could never have been ſuggeſted as a reaſon to hinder us from thinking that he would ever caſt them off: for, from the beginning, all nations and all things are alike known to God. But the verb γινωσκω, in Helleniſtic uſe, has all the latitude of ſignification which the verb ידע *jadang*, has, being that whereby the Seventy commonly render the Hebrew word. Now the Hebrew word means not only to *know*, in the common acceptation, but *to acknowledge* and *to approve*. Nothing is more common in Scripture than this uſe. "The Lord *knoweth*, γινωσκει the way of the righte-"ous§," that is, *approveth*. "Then I will profeſs un-"to them, I never *knew* you," εγνων, *acknowledged* you for mine.‖ "If any man love God, the ſame is *known* "of him¶," εγνωσται, *acknowledged*. If, therefore, in the paſſage under examination, we underſtand in this way the verb γινωσκω, adding the import of the prepoſition προ, *before*, *formerly*, *heretofore*, the meaning is both clear and pertinent: "God hath not caſt off his people whom heretofore he acknowledged."

I ſhall juſt add a ſenſe of the verb προγινωσκω as uſed by the Apoſtle Peter**, different from both the former. The verb γινωσκω in claſſical uſe often denotes *to decree*, *to ordain*, *to give ſentence* as a judge, and therefore, προγινωσκω, *to foreordain*, &c. It is in this ſenſe only we can underſtand προεγνωσμενου προ καταβολης κοσμου, which our interpreters have rightly rendered "*foreordained*, "before the foundation of the world." But they have "not ſo well tranſlated the verbal noun προγνωσις in the ſecond verſe of the chapter *foreknowledge*, which renders the expreſſion, indefinite and obſcure, not to ſay, improper. It ought, for the ſame reaſon, to have been *predetermination*. The ſame word, in the ſame ſignification, occurs in the Acts††, where it is alſo improperly rendered *foreknowledge*.

§ 22. IT may be thought that, in the compoſition of ſubſtantives or of an adjective and a ſubſtantive in familar uſe, there is hardly a poſſibility, of error, the import of both the ſimple words being eſſential to the compound. But this is not without exception, as βωμολοχος, συκοφαντης, χειροτονια, and

* Rom. xi. 2.
† Acts, xxvi. 5.
‡ vii. 3.
§ Pſalm i. 6.
‖ Matth. vii. 23.
¶ 1 Cor. viii. 3.
** 1 Peter, i. 20.
†† Acts, ii. 23.

and many others, evince. It is indeed very probable, that the import of ſuch terms originally was, what the etymology indicates. But in their application, ſuch variations are inſenſibly introduced by cuſtom, as ſometimes fix them at laſt in a meaning very different from the primary ſenſe, or that to which the component parts would lead us.

I ſhall bring for an example a term about which tranſlators have been very little divided. It is the word σκληροκαρδια, always rendered in the common verſion, *hardneſs of heart*. Nothing can be more literal, or, to appearance, more juſt. Σκληροκαρδια is compounded of σκληρος *hard*, and καρδια *heart*. Nor can it be denied that theſe Engliſh words, taken ſeverally, are, in almoſt every caſe, expreſſive of the full ſenſe of the Greek words, alſo taken ſeverally. Yet there is reaſon to ſuſpect that the Greek compound does not anſwer to the meaning conſtantly affixed by us to *hardneſs of heart* or, in one word, *hardheartedneſs*. Let us recur to examples. In Matthew*, we read thus; "Moſes, becauſe of *the hardneſs of your* "*hearts*, προς την σκληροκαρδιαν ὑμων, ſuffered you to put "away your wives." Now theſe terms *hardneſs of heart* with us always denote cruelty, inhumanity, barbarity. It does not appear that this is our Lord's meaning in this paſſage. And though the paſſage might be ſo paraphraſed, as would give a plauſibility to this interpretation, I do not recollect that this vice of cruelty, as a national vice, was ever imputed to them by Moſes; though he often charges them with incredulity, obſtinacy, and rebellion. As there is nothing, however, in the context, that can be called deciſive, I recur to the other paſſages in the New Teſtament wherein the word is found. Theſe are but two, and both of them in Mark's Goſpel. One of them is†, where the ſame occurrence is recorded as in the paſſage of Matthew above referred to. In theſe two parallel places there is ſo little variation in the words, that the doubt as to the meaning of this term muſt equally affect them both. The other paſſage is‡, in the account given of our Lord's appearances to his diſciples after his reſurrection. "Afterwards he appeared unto the eleven, as they ſat "at meat, and upbraided them with *their unbelief and* "*hardneſs of heart*, την απιστιαν αυτων και σκληροκαρδιαν, "becauſe they believed not them which had ſeen him "after he was riſen." Nothing can be clearer than that the word here has no relation to *inhumanity*; as this great event gave no handle for diſplaying either this vice or the contrary virtue. Some commentators, after Grotius, render it here *incredulity*, making our Saviour expreſs the ſame fault by both words απιστια and σκληροκαρδια. I do not ſay that the uſe of ſuch ſynonymas is without example in Scripture; though I would not recur to them where another interpretation were equally natural, and even more probable. I think, therefore that by the firſt of theſe terms the effect is meant, and by the ſecond the cauſe; that is, their ſtiff and untractable temper, their indocility or perverſeneſs. Now this is a fault with which the Jews are frequently upbraided by Moſes. Beſides, this interpretation perfectly ſuits the ſenſe of both paſſages In that firſt quoted, as well as in this, the connexion is evident. "Moſes, becauſe of your untractable "diſpoſition, permitted you to divorce your wives;" leſt, by making the marriage tie indiſſoluble, ye had perverſely renounced marriage altogether, ſaying, as ſome of the diſciples did, "If the caſe of the man "be ſo with his wife, it is not good to marry." The ſenſe *unbelief*, which Grotius puts upon it, is rather more forced in that paſſage than the common acceptation. Caſtalio renders it very properly *pervicacia*.

If, for further ſatisfaction, I recur to the Septuagint, I find invariably a connexion with *perverſeneſs*, never with *inhumanity*. Where we read in Engliſh§, "Circumciſe the foreſkin of your heart, and be no "more ſtiff-necked," The Seventy have it, Περιτεμεισθε την σκληροκαρδιαν ὑμων, και τον τραχηλον ὑμων ου σκληρυνειτε ετι. Here the oppoſition of the members in the ſentence, which, in the Oriental taſte, gives the ſame command, firſt in the poſitive form, and then in the negative, renders the meaning indubitable. The adjective σκληροκαρδιος is uſed in the Book of Proverbs ‖ for perverſe or untractable. Ὁ σκληροκαρδιος, in Hebrew לב עקש *ghakeſh leb*, ου συναντα αγαθοις; rendered juſtly in the Vulgate, *Qui perverſi cordis eſt, non inveniet bonum*; in Engliſh, "He that hath a froward heart, "findeth no good." There is another example of this adjective in Ezekiel¶, which appears to me deciſive. The verſe runs thus in our verſion: "The houſe of "Iſrael will not hearken unto thee, for they will not "hearken unto me, for all the houſe of Iſrael are impu"dent and *hardhearted*;" φιλονεικοι εισι και σκληροκαρδιοι. It is plain, from the context, that nothing is advanced which can fix on them the charge of inhumanity; but every thing points to their indocile and untractable temper. In like manner, when the verb σκληρυνω is followed by την καρδιαν, the meaning is invariably either to *become*, or to *render*, *refractory*, *rebellious*, not *cruel* or *inhumane*. This is evidently the ſenſe of it as applied to Pharoah, whoſe obſtinacy the ſevereſt judgments hardly could ſurmount. And can any perſon doubt that the meaning of the Pſalmiſt, when he ſays**, *To-day if ye ſhall hear his voice*, μη σκληρυνητε τας καρδιας ὑμων, is, *be not contumacious* or *ſtiff-necked*, *as in the provocation?* It is impoſſible either to recur to the

* Matth. xix. 8. † x. 5. ‡ xvi. 14. § Deut. x. 16. ‖ xvii. 20.
¶ iii. 7. ** Pſal. xcv. 7, 8.

the hiſtory referred to*, or to the comment on the paſſage in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews†, and not perceive this to be a full expreſſion of the ſenſe. *Hard-hearted*, therefore, in our language, which ſtands always in oppoſition to *tenderhearted* or *compaſſionate*, is not a juſt tranſlation, though, in ſome ſenſe, it may be called a literal tranſlation, of σκληροκαρδιος.

§ 23. If we enquire a little into the figurative ſignifications given to the ſimple word καρδια by the ſacred penmen, we ſhall find their application of the compound to *contumacy* or *indocility*, as natural as ours is to *cruelty* and *unfeelingneſs*. Let it be obſerved then that, though the Greek word καρδια, when uſed in the proper ſenſe for the part of the body ſo denominated, is equivalent to the Engliſh word *heart*; it is not always ſo, when uſed metaphorically. With us it is made by figure to ſtand, ſometimes for *courage*, ſometimes for *affection*, of which it is conſidered as the ſeat; but hardly ever, that I remember, for *underſtanding*. To denote this faculty, we ſometimes ſpeak of a good or a bad *head*; we alſo uſe the term *brain*. This, and not the *heart*, we regard as the ſeat of intelligence and diſcernment. Yet this was a frequent uſe of the term *heart* among the ancients, not the Hebrews only, but even the Greeks and the Romans. Καρδια in Greek, even in the beſt uſe, as well as *cor* in Latin, are employed to denote diſcernment and underſtanding. Hence, the word *cordatus* in Latin, for *wiſe, judicious, prudent*.

For the preſent purpoſe it ſuffices to produce a few inſtances from Scripture, which will put the matter beyond a doubt. For the ſake of brevity, I ſhall but juſt name the things attributed to the heart, referring to the paſſages in the margin; that from them every perſon may judge of the figurative application. Firſt then, intelligence is aſcribed to it‡, alſo reaſoning§, likewiſe blindneſs‖, doubts¶, faith**, thought††, compariſon‡‡, reflection§§, in ſhort, all that we commonly conſider as belonging to the intellectual faculty, are applied in Scripture to the heart, a term which, in figurative ſtyle, is uſed with very great latitude. In this view, of the metonymy, σκληροκαρδιος comes naturally to ſignify *indocile, untractable*, of an underſtanding ſo hard, that inſtruction cannot penetrate it. Of ſimilar formation is the term *thick-ſkulled* with us. But the ſenſe is not entirely the ſame. This implies mere incapacity, that an untoward diſpoſition.

§ 24. Here it may not be be improper to ſuggeſt a caution, for preventing miſtakes, not only in the interpretation of Scripture, but in that of all ancient writers. Though a particular word in a modern language, may exactly correſpond with a certain word in a foreign or a dead language, when both are uſed literally and properly; theſe words may be very far from correſponding, when uſed metaphorically, or when affected by any trope whatever. Nor does this remark hold in any thing more frequently than in that ſort of metonymy, ſo common amongſt every people, whereby ſome parts of the body, eſpecially of the entrails, have been ſubſtituted to denote certain powers or affections of the mind, with which they are ſuppoſed to be connected. The opinions of different nations and different ages, on this article, differ ſo widely from one another, that the figurative ſenſe in one tongue, is a very unſafe guide to the figurative ſenſe in another. In ſome inſtances they ſeem even to to ſtand in direct oppoſition to each other. The *ſpleen* was accounted by the ancient Greeks and Romans the ſeat of mirth and laughter; by us moderns it is held (I ſuppoſe with equal reaſon), the ſeat of ill-humour and melancholy. When, therefore, it is evident that the name is, in one of thoſe ancient languages, uſed not properly but tropically; what ſome would call a literal tranſlation into a modern tongue, would, in fact, be a miſrepreſentation of the author, and a groſs perverſion of the ſenſe §§.

§ 25. I shall add but one other example, of the miſinterpretation of a compound word, ariſing from the apparent, rather than the real, import of its etymology. The word ὁμοιοπαθης occurs twice in the New Teſtament. The firſt time is on occaſion of the miraculous cure of the lame man by Paul and Barnabas at Lyſtra. When the people would have offered ſacrifice to the Apoſtles, ſuppoſing them to be two of their

* Heb. iii. & iv. † Heb. iii. & iv. ‡ Matth. xiii. 15. § Mark, ii. 6.

‖ iii. 5, &c. The term is πωρωσις, *calloufneſs*, rendered *hardneſs* in the common tranſlation, but which as often means *blindneſs*, and is ſo rendered Rom. xi. 25. Eph iv. 18. A ſenſe here more ſuitable to the context.

¶ Mark, xi. 23. ** Rom. x. 10. †† Acts, viii. 22. ‡‡ Luke, ii. 19.

§§ I had occaſion to conſider a little this ſubject in another work, The Philoſophy of Rhetoric, Book III. Ch. I. Sect. II. Part I. I there took notice of a remark of Cornutus on theſe words of the firſt ſatire of Perſius: *Sum petulanti ſplene cachinno*. Which, as it is much to my preſent purpoſe, and not long, I ſhall here repeat. "Phyſici dicunt homines ſplene ridere, felle "iraſci, jecore amare, corde ſapere, et pulmone jactari." To the ſame purpoſe, I find in a very ancient piece, called the Teſtaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, ſuppoſed to be the work of a Chriſtian of the firſt century, the following ſentiment in the Teſtament of Naphtali, introduced for the ſake of illuſtrating that God made all things good, adapting each to its proper uſe, καρδιαν εις φρονησιν, ηπαρ προς θυμον, χολην προς πικριαν, εις γελωτα σπλαγχνα νεφρους εις παιδαγωγιαν. Grab. Spicil. patrum I. Secul. T. I. Ed. 2. p. 212. This, though differing a little from the remark made by the commentator on Perſius, perfectly coincides in what regards the *heart* and the *ſpleen*.

their gods Jupiter and Mercury; they no ſooner heard of their intention, than they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out and ſaying (as in the common tranſlation, "Sirs, why do ye theſe things? "we alſo are men *of like paſſions with you**," ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ὑμῖν. The other occaſion of the words occurring, is where the Apoſtle James ſaid, as our tranſlators render it, "Elias was a man *ſubject to like paſſions as we* "*are*, ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν, and he prayed earneſtly that it "might not rain†." From which paſſages I have heard it gravely inferred, that a ſuperiority over the paſſions is hardly to be expected from the influence even of the moſt divine religion, or the moſt diſtinguiſhing lights of the Spirit; ſince ſacred writ itſelf ſeems, in this reſpect, to put Jews, Chriſtians, and Pagans, nay prophets, apoſtles, and idolatrous prieſts, and people, all upon a level.

But this ariſes merely from the miſtranſlation of the word ὁμοιοπαθὴς, concerning which, I beg leave to offer the following remarks: 1ſt, I remark that it is found only twice in the New Teſtament, does not occur in the verſion of the Seventy, and but once in the Apocryphal writings, where it is applied to the earth‡, in which there is nothing analogous to human paſſions, though there is ſome analogy to human ſufferings and diſſolution; and that therefore we have no reaſon, agreeably to an obſervation lately made§, to conſider this term as affected by the idiom of the ſynagogue. 2dly, If we recur to claſſical uſe, we find that it implies no more than *fellow-mortal*, and has no relation to what, in our language, is peculiarly called *paſſion*: and, 3dly, That with this, the etymology rightly underſtood, perfectly agrees. The primary ſignification of πάθος in Greek, and of the unclaſſical term *paſſio* in Latin, is *ſuffering*; the firſt from πάσχειν, the ſecond from *pati* to ſuffer. Thence they are adopted to denote calamity, diſeaſe, and death; thence alſo they are taken ſometimes to denote thoſe affections of the mind, which are in their nature violent, and are conſidered as implying pain and ſuffering; nay, the Engliſh word *paſſion* is in this manner applied (but it is in a ſort of technical language) to the death and ſufferings of our Lord.

Now, as to the term ὁμοιοπαθὴς, in the manner in which it is rendered by our interpreters, the argument employed by the Apoſtles to the Lycaonians, loſes all its force and ſignificance. The Pagans never denied that the gods whom they adored were beings of like paſſions with themſelves; nay, they did not ſcruple to attribute the moſt diſgraceful, and the moſt turbulent, paſſions to their deities. And as little as any were the two divinities exempted, whom they ſuppoſed Paul and Barnabas to be; but then they always attributed to them a total exemption from mortality and diſeaſe. It would have been, therefore, impertinent to ſay to idolaters, who miſtook them for gods, "We are ſubject to the like paſſions with you;" for this their prieſts and poets had uniformly taught them both of Jupiter and of Mercury. But it was pertinent to ſay, "We "are your fellow-mortals," as liable as you to diſeaſe and death. For, if that was the caſe with the two Apoſtles, the people would readily admit, they were not the gods they took them for. Indeed, this was not only the principal, but, I may almoſt ſay, the ſole, diſtinction they made between gods and men. As to irregular luſts and paſſions, they ſeem even to have aſcribed them to the celeſtials in a higher degree, in proportion, as it were, to their ſuperior power. And, in regard to the application to Elijah, in the other paſſage quoted, let it not be thought any objection to the interpretation here given, that the Prophet was tranſlated, and did not die: for all that is implied in the Apoſtle's argument is, that his body was naturally mortal and diſſolvable as well as ours; a point which was never called in queſtion, notwithſtanding his miraculous deliverance from death. I ſhall only add, that the explanation here given is entirely conformable to the verſion of thoſe paſſages in the Vulgate, and to that of all the other tranſlations, ancient and modern, of any name.

§ 26. FROM all that has been ſaid on this topic, it is evident that, in doubtful caſes, etymology is but a dangerous guide; and, though always entitled to ſome attention, never, unleſs in the total failure of all other reſources, to be entirely reſted in. From her tribunal there lies always an appeal to *uſe*, in caſes wherein uſe can be diſcovered, whoſe deciſion is final, according to the obſervation of Horace,

Quem penes arbitrium eſt, et jus, et norma loquendi.

I have been the more particular on this head, becauſe etymology ſeems to be a favourite with many modern interpreters, and the ſource of a great proportion of their criticiſms. And indeed, it muſt be owned that, of all the poſſible ways of becoming a critic in a dead or a foreign language, etymology is the eaſieſt. A ſcanty knowledge of the elements, with the aid of a good Lexicon, and a plauſible fluency of expreſſion, will be fully ſufficient for the purpoſe. I ſhall add a few inſtances in this taſte from ſome modern tranſlations of the New Teſtament; though I am far from inſinuating that the above mentioned qualifications for criticiſing, were all that the authors were poſſeſſed of. Some of them, on the contrary, have, in other inſtances, diſplayed critical abilities very reſpectable.

* Acts, xiv. 15. † James, v. 17. ‡ Wiſd. vii. 3. § Sect. 8.

But where is the man who, on every occaſion, is equal to himſelf? The word σπλαγχνισθη*, is rendered, by the gentlemen of Port Royal, *Ses entrailles furent emues de compaſſion*, on which Wynne ſeems to have improved in ſaying, *His bowels yearned with compaſſion.* Ευδοκησαν†, is rendered by the former, *ont reſolu avec beaucoup d'affection.* Δεησις ενεργουμενη‡, is tranſlated by Doddridge, *Prayer wrought by the energy of the Spirit.* Σκηνωσει§, by Diodati, *Tendera un padiglione.* Κεκοπτουκασιτες‖, by Beza, *cum ipſi per ſuffragia creaſſent*, and κληρονομησουσι¶, *hæreditario jure obtinebunt.* The Vulgate too, ſometimes without neceſſity, but more rarely, adopts the ſame paraphraſtical method. For thoſe examples above referred to, which occur in the Goſpel, ſee the notes on the places.

* Matth. ix. 36. † Rom. xv. 26, 27. ‡ James, v. 16. § Rev. viii. 15.
‖ Acts, xiv. 23. ¶ Matth. v. 5.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION THE FIFTH.

Of the proper Verſion of ſome Names of principal Import in the New Teſtament.

THE religious inſtitution of which the Lord Jeſus is the author, is diſtinguiſhed in the New Teſtament by particular names and phraſes, with the true import of which is of great conſequence that we be acquainted, in order to form a diſtinct apprehenſion of the nature and end of the whole. A very ſmall deviation here may lead ſome into groſs miſtakes, and conceal from others, in a conſiderable degree, the ſpirit which this inſtitution breathes, and the diſcoveries which it brings. I think it neceſſary, therefore, to examine this ſubject a little, in order to lay before the critical, the judicious and the candid, my reaſons for leaving, in ſome particulars which at firſt may appear of little moment, the beaten track of interpreters, and giving, it may be ſaid, new names to known things, where there cannot be any material difference of meaning. The affectation of rejecting a word, becauſe old (if neither obſcure nor obſolete), and of preferring another, becauſe new (if it be not more appoſite or expreſſive), is juſtly held contemptible; but, without doubt, it would be an extreme on the other ſide, not leſs hurtful, to pay a greater veneration to names, that is to mere ſounds, than to the things ſignified by them. And ſurely, a tranſlator is juſtly chargeable with this fault, who, in any degree, ſacrifices propriety, and that perſpicuity, which, in a great meaſure, flows from it, to a ſcrupulous (not to ſay ſuperſtitious) attachment to terms which, as the phraſe is, have been conſecrated by long uſe. But of this I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more afterwards.

The moſt common appellation given to this inſtitution, or religious diſpenſation, in the New Teſtament, is, ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, or των ουρανων; and the title given to the manifeſtation of this new ſtate, is moſt frequently το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας, &c. and ſometimes, when conſidered under an aſpect ſomewhat different, ἡ καινη διαθηκη. The great perſonage himſelf, to whoſe adminiſtration the whole is entruſted, is, in contradiſtinction to all others, denominated ὁ χριστος. I ſhall in this diſcourſe make a few obſervations on each of the terms above mentioned,

---

PART I.

Of the phraſe ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, *or* των ουρανων.

IN the the phraſe ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, or των ουρανων, there is a manifeſt alluſion to the predictions in which this economy was revealed by the Prophets in the Old Teſtament, particularly by the Prophet Daniel, who mentions it, in one place*, as *a kingdom* βασιλεια, *which the God of heaven would ſet up, and which ſhould never be deſtroyed*: in another† as a kingdom to be given, with glory and dominion over all people, nations, and languages, to one like a ſon of man. And the prophet Micah‡, ſpeaking of the ſame era, repreſents it as a time when Jehovah, having removed all the afflictions of his people, would reign over them in Mount Zion thenceforth even for ever. To the ſame purpoſe, though not ſo explicit, are the declarations of other prophets. To theſe predictions there is a manifeſt reference in the title ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, or των ουρανων, or ſimply ἡ βασιλεια, given in the New Teſtament, to the religious conſtitution which would obtain under the Meſſiah. It occurs very often, and is, if I miſtake not, uniformly, in the common tranſlation, rendered *kingdom*.

* ii. 44. † vii. 13, 14. ‡ iv. 6. 7.

§ 2. THAT the import of the term is always either *kingdom*, or ſomething nearly related to kingdom, is beyond all queſtion; but it is no leſs ſo, that, if regard be had to the propriety of our own idiom, and conſequently to the perſpicuity of the verſion, the Engliſh word will not anſwer on every occaſion. In moſt caſes βασιλεια anſwers to the Latin *regnum*. But this word is of more extenſive meaning than the Engliſh, being equally adapted to expreſs both our terms *reign*, and *kingdom*. The firſt relates to the time or duration of the ſovereignty; the ſecond, to the place or country over which it extends. Now, though it is manifeſt in the Goſpels, that it is much oftener the time, than the place, that is alluded to; it is never, in the common verſion, tranſlated *reign*, but always *kingdom*. Yet the expreſſion is often thereby rendered exceedingly awkward, not to ſay abſurd. Uſe indeed ſoftens every thing. Hence it is that, in reading our Bible, we are inſenſible of thoſe improprieties which, in any other book, would ſtrike us at firſt hearing. Such are thoſe expreſſions which apply motion to a kingdom, as when mention is made of its *coming*, *approaching*, and the like; but I ſhould not think it worth while to contend for the obſervance of a ſcrupulous propriety, if the violation of it did not affect the ſenſe, and lead the reader into miſtakes. Now this is, in ſeveral inſtances, the certain conſequence of improperly rendering βασιλεια *kingdom*.

§ 3. WHEN βασιλεια means *reign*, and is followed by των ουρανων, the tranſlation *kingdom of heaven* evidently tends to miſlead the reader. Heaven, thus conſtrued with kingdom, ought, in our language, by the rules of grammatical propriety, to denote the region under the kingly government ſpoken of. But finding, as we advance, that this called the *kingdom of heaven* is actually upon the earth, or, as it were, travelling to the earth and almoſt arrived, there neceſſarily ariſes ſuch a confuſion of ideas as clouds the text, and, by conſequence, weakens the impreſſion it would otherwiſe make upon our minds. It may be ſaid indeed, that the import of ſuch expreſſions in Scripture is now ſo well known, that they can hardly be miſtaken. But I am far from thinking that this is the caſe. Were it ſaid only that they are become ſo familar to us that, without ever reflecting on the matter, we take it for granted that we underſtand them; there is no ſentiment to the juſtneſs of which I can more readily ſubſcribe. But then the familiarity, inſtead of anſwering a good, anſwers a bad, purpoſe, as it ſerves to conceal our ignorance, even from ourſelves. It is not, therefore, the being accuſtomed to hear ſuch phraſes, that will make them be univerſally, or even generally, apprehended by the people. And to thoſe who may have heard of the expoſition commonly given of them, the conception of the kingdom of heaven, as denoting a ſort of dominion upon the earth, a conception which the mind attains indirectly, by the help of a comment, is always feebler than that which is conveyed directly by the native energy of the expreſſion. Not but that the words βασιλεια των ουρανων are often rightly tranſlated *kingdom of heaven*, being often manifeſtly applied to the ſtate of perfect felicity to be enjoyed in the world to come. But it is equally evident that this is not always the meaning of the phraſe.

§ 4. THERE are two ſenſes wherein the word *heaven* in this expreſſion may be underſtood. Either it ſignifies the place ſo called, or it is a metonymy for God, who is in Scripture, ſometimes by periphraſis, denominated *he that dwelleth in heaven*. When the former is the ſenſe of the term ουρανοι, the phraſe is properly rendered *the kingdom of heaven;* when the latter, *the reign of heaven*. Let it be remarked in paſſing, in regard to the ſenſe laſt given of the word ουρανοι as ſignifying *God*, that we are fully authoriſed to affirm it to be ſcriptural. I ſhould have hardly thought it neceſſary to make this remark, if I had not occaſionally obſerved ſuch phraſes as *the aſſiſtance of heaven*, and *addreſſes to heaven*, criticiſed and cenſured in ſome late performances, as ſavouring more of the Pagan or the Chineſe phraſeology, than of the Chriſtian. That they are perfectly comformable to the latter, muſt be clear to every one who reads his Bible with attention. Daniel, in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, ſays*, *Thy kingdom ſhall be ſure unto thee, after that thou ſhalt have known that the* Heavens *do rule*. The prophet had ſaid in the preceding verſe, *Seven times ſhall paſs over thee, till thou know that the* Moſt High *ruleth in the kingdom of men*. Thus he who is denominated the *Moſt High* in one verſe, is termed *the Heavens* in the following. The Pſalmiſt Aſaph ſays of profligates†, *They ſet their mouth againſt the* Heavens; that is, *they vent blaſphemies againſt God*. The phraſe in the New Teſtament η βασιλεια των ουρανων, is almoſt as common as η βασιλεια του Θεου. And though it may be affirmed that the regimen in the one expreſſes the proprietor of the kingdom, in the other the place; it is evident that this does not hold always. In parallel paſſages in the different Goſpels, where the ſame facts are recorded, one of theſe expreſſions is uſed by one Evangeliſt, and the other as equivalent by another. Nay, the phraſe η βασιλεια των ουρανων, is adopted when it is manifeſt, that the place of dominion ſuggeſted is earth, not heaven; and that therefore the term can be underſtood only as a ſynonyma for γης. The prodigal

* iv. 26.

† Pſal. lxxiii. 9.

digal ſays to his father*, *Father, I have ſinned againſt* Heaven *and before thee;* that is, *againſt God and thee.* Otherwiſe, to ſpeak of ſinning againſt an inanimate object, would be exceedingly unſuitable both to the Chriſtian theology and to the Jewiſh. *The baptiſm of John*†, ſays our Lord, *whence was it; from* Heaven, *or of men? From Heaven*, that is, *from God.* Divine authority is here oppoſed to human. This difference, however, in the ſenſe of ουρανος, makes no difference to a tranſlator, inaſmuch as the vernacular term with us admits the ſame latitude with the Hebrew and the Greek.

§ 5. THAT βασιλεια ought ſometimes to be rendered *reign*, and not *kingdom*, I ſhall further evince when I illuſtrate the import of the words κηρυσσω, ευαγγελιζω, and ſome others. Iſaiah, Daniel, Micah, and others of the Prophets, had encouraged the people to expect a time, when the Lord of hoſts ſhould reign in Mount Zion and in Jeruſalem, when the people of God ſhould be redeemed from their enemies, and made joyful in the Meſſiah their King. It was this happy epoch that was generally underſtood to be denominated by the phraſes βασιλεια του Θεου, and βασιλεια των ουρανων, *the reign of God*, and *the reign of Heaven:* the approach of which was firſt announced by the Baptiſt, afterwards by our Lord himſelf and his Apoſtles. Βασιλεια is applicable in both acceptations, and it needs only be obſerved that, when it refers to the time, it ought to be rendered *reign*, when to the place, *kingdom.* For this reaſon, when it is conſtrued with the verb κηρυσσω, ευαγγελιζω, καταγγελλω or the noun ευαγγελιον, it ought invariably to be *reign*, as alſo when it is ſpoken of as come, coming, or approaching.

§ 6. THE French have two words correſponding to ours, *regne* reign, and *royaume* kingdom. Their interpreters have often fallen into the ſame fault with ours, ſubſtituting the latter word for the former: yet, in no French tranſlation that I have ſeen, is this done ſo uniformly as in ours. In the Lord's Prayer, for example, they all ſay, *ton regne vienne*, not *ton royaume*, thy *reign* come, not thy *kingdom.* On the other hand, when mention is made of entrance or admiſſion into the βασιλεια, or excluſion from it, or where there is a manifeſt reference to the ſtate of the bleſſed hereafter; in all theſe caſes, and perhaps a few others, wherein the ſenſe may eaſily be collected from the concontext, it ought to be rendered *kingdom*, and not *reign.*

§ 7. THERE are a few paſſages, it muſt be acknowledged, in which neither of the Engliſh words can be conſidered as a tranſlation of βασιλεια ſtrictly proper. In ſome of the parables‡, it evidently means adminiſtration, or method of governing; and in one of them § the word denotes royalty or royal authority, there being a manifeſt alluſion to what had been done by Herod the Great, and his immediate ſucceſſor, in recurring to the Roman ſenate in order to be inveſted with the title and dignity of King of Judea, then dependent upon Rome. But where there is a proper attention to the ſcope of the place, one will be at no loſs to diſcover the import of the word.

PART II.

Of the Name το ευαγγελιον.

I PROCEED to enquire into the meaning of the word το ευαγγελιον. This term, agreeably to its etymology, from ευ *bene* and αγγελια *nuncium*, always in claſſical uſe, where it occurs but rarely, denotes either good news, or the reward given to the bearer of good news. Let us ſee what ought to be accounted the ſcriptural uſe of the term. Ευαγγελιον and ευαγγελια occur ſix times in the Septuagint in the Books of Samuel and Kings. I reckon them as one word, becauſe they are of the ſame origin, are uſed indiſcriminately, and always ſupply the place of the ſame Hebrew word בשרה *beſſarah.* In five of theſe the meaning is *good news;* in the ſixth, the word denotes the reward given for bringing good news. In like manner, the verb ευαγγελιζειν, or ευαγγελιζεσθαι, which occurs much oftener in the Septuagint than the noun, is always the verſion of the Hebrew verb בשר *baſſar*, *læta annunciare*, to tell good news. It ought to be remarked alſo, that ευαγγελιζω is the only word by which the Hebrew verb is rendered into Greek: nor do I know any word in the Greek language that is more ſtrictly of one ſignification than this verb. In one inſtance the verbal מבשר *mebaſſer*, is indeed uſed for one who brings tidings, though not good‖, but in that place the

* Luke, xv. 18, 21. † Matth. xxi. 25. ‡ Matth. xviii. 23. § Luke, xix. 12. 15. ‖ 1 Sam. iv. 17.

the Seventy have not employed the verb ευαγγελιζω, or any of its derivatives. One paſſage*, wherein the Septuagint uſes the verb ευαγγελιζομαι, has alſo been alledged as an exception from the common acceptation. But that this is improperly called an exception, muſt be manifeſt to every one who reflects that the total defeat of the Iſraelitiſh army, with the ſlaughter of the king of Iſrael and his ſons, muſt have been the moſt joyful tidings that could have been related in Gath and Aſkelon, two Philiſtine cities. The word occurs ſeveral times in the prophets, particularly in Iſaiah, and is always rendered in the common verſion, either by the phraſe *to bring good tidings*, or by ſome terms nearly equivalent. It is ſometimes alſo ſo rendered in the New Teſtament†.

§ 2. Now let it be obſerved that, when the word is introduced in the Goſpels, it is generally either in a quotation from the Prophets, or in evident alluſion to their words. Thus πτωχοι ευαγγελιζονται, which our tranſlators render, *To the poor the goſpel is preached* ‡, the whole context ſhows to be an alluſion to what is ſaid by the prophet Iſaiah §, in whom the correſponding phraſe is rendered, *preach good tidings to the meek*. But nothing can be more to my purpoſe, than that noted paſſage where we are told‖, that the place in Iſaiah was read by our Lord in the ſynagogue of Nazareth. The words in the common tranſlation of the Goſpel are theſe, *The ſpirit of the Lord is upon me, becauſe he hath anointed me to preach the goſpel*, ευαγγελιζεσθαι, *to the poor, he hath ſent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of ſight to the blind, to ſet at liberty them that are bruiſed, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord*. Now I cannot help obſerving of this paſſage, that the meaning would have been more perſpicuouſly conveyed, and its beauty and energy would have been better preſerved, if our tranſlators had kept cloſer to the manner in which they had rendered it in the Old Teſtament. There the term ευαγγελιζεσθαι is rendered *to preach good tidings*. And though it is certain, agreeably to our Lord's declaration, that the goſpel, with its ſpiritual bleſſings, are here held forth to us, it is ſtill under the figure of temporal bleſſings, and therefore it is very improperly introduced by its diſtinguiſhing appellation into the verſion, which ought to convey the literal, not the figurative, ſenſe of the original.

Ευαγγελιζεσθαι πτωχοις, *to bring good tidings to the poor* or afflicted, agreeably to the extenſive ſignification of the Hebrew word, is the general title of the meſſage, and comprehends the whole. It is explained by being branched out into the particulars which immediately follow. For, if it be aſked, What is the good tidings brought to the afflicted? the anſwer is, a cure to the broken hearted, deliverance to the captives, ſight to the blind. It is the Lord's jubilee, which brings freedom to the ſlave, acquittance to the debtor, and relief to the oppreſſed. Now that the Goſpel is herein admirably delineated, is manifeſt. But ſtill it is preſented to us under figures, and therefore to mention it by its peculiar title, in the midſt of the figurative deſcription, is to efface, in a great meaſure that deſcription; it is to jumble injudiciouſly the ſign and the thing ſignified. It is, as if one ſhould confound, in an apologue or parable, the literal ſenſe with the moral, and aſſert of the one what is ſtrictly true only of the other; by which means no diſtinct image would be preſented to the mind. Or it is, as when a painter ſupplies the defects in his work by labels, and, inſtead of a picture, preſents us with a confuſed jumble, wherein ſome things are painted, and ſome things deſcribed in words. But it is not in our verſion only, but in moſt modern tranſlations, that this confuſion in rendering this beautiful paſſage has appeared.

§ 3. I SHALL add but one other inſtance of a quotation from the prophets: Ως ωραιοι οι ποδες των ευαγγελιζομενων ειρηνην, των ευαγγελιζομενων τα αγαθα¶. In the common verſion, as quoted in the New Teſtament: *How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the goſpel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things*. It would have been better here alſo, on many accounts, to keep cloſer to the original in Iſaiah**, whence the paſſage was taken, and to tranſlate it thus: "How beautiful are "the feet of them who bring the joyful meſſage of "peace, the joyful news of good things;" at the ſame time, we acknowledge, it is with a particular alluſion to that ſpiritual peace, and thoſe eternal good things, procured to us by Jeſus Chriſt. But the beauty and energy of the alluſion and implied ſimilitude are deſtroyed, or rather there is no more alluſion or ſimilitude in the words, when the characteriſtic deſcription intended by the Prophet, is in a manner thrown aſide, and in its ſtead is inſerted the name appropriated to the diſpenſation. This at leaſt is in part done; for the Prophet's figures are neither totally laid aſide, nor totally retained. Inſtead of imitating his ſimplicity of manner, they have made a jumble of the ſenſe implied, and the ſenſe expreſſed. For this purpoſe they have rendered the ſame word (which is repeated in the two clauſes) in one clauſe, *preach the goſpel*, according to the ſenſe juſtly ſuppoſed to be figured by it, in the other clauſe, *bring glad tidings*, according to the letter. I can ſee no reaſon for this want of uniformity, unleſs perhaps the notion that *the goſpel*

* 2 Sam. i. 20.
† Luke, i. 19. ii. 10. viii. 1. Acts, xiii. 32. Rom. x. 15. 1 Theſſ. iii. 6.
‡ Matth. xi. 5. Luke, vii. 22.
§ lxi. 1.
‖ Luke, iv. 18, 19.
¶ Romans, x. 15.
** lii. 7.

gospel of good things founded more awkwardly than *the gospel of peace.*

§ 4. THE Prophet's design undoubtedly was, to deliver it as an universal truth amply confirmed by experience, that the message of peace and prosperity to those who had been oppressed and afflicted by the ravages of war, and its various unhappy consequences, was so charming, that it could transform a most disagreeable into a pleasing object. The feet of those who had travelled far in a hot country, through rough and dusty roads, present a spectacle naturally offensive to the beholder; nevertheless, the consideration that the persons themselves are to us the messengers of peace and felicity; and that it is in bringing these welcome tidings they have contracted that sordid appearance, can in an instant convert deformity into beauty, and make us behold with delight this indication of their embassy, their dirty feet, as being the natural consequence of the long journey they have made. A thought somewhat similar occurs in Horace*, who speaking of victors returning with glory from a well-fought field, exhibits them as—*Non indecoro pulvere sordidos.* The poet perceives a charm, something decorous, in the very dust and sweat, with which the warriors are smeared, and which serve to recal to the mind of the spectator, the glorious toils of the day: thus, things in themselves ugly and disgusting, share, when associated in the mind with things delightful, in the beauty and attractions of those things with which they are connected. But this sentiment is lost in the common version; for it might puzzle the most sagacious reader to devise a reason why the feet in particular of the Christian preacher should be declared to excel in beauty.

§ 5. Now, in all the passages quoted from the Prophets, it appears so natural, and so proper every way, to give them in the words which had been used in translating the prophecies, when the words in the New Testament will bear the same version, that one is at a loss to conceive what could move the translators to depart from this rule. Ought they, where no ground is given for it in the original, either to make the sacred penmen appear to have misquoted the Prophets, or to make the unlearned reader imagine, that the Scriptures used by them, differed from those used by us, where there is not in fact any difference. Let it be observed, that I say, when the words in the New Testament will bear the same version with those in the Old; for I am not for carrying this point so far as some translators have done, who, when there is a real difference in the import of the expressions, are for correcting one of the sacred writers by the other. This is not the part of a faithful translator, who ought candidly to represent what his author says, and leave it to the judicious critic, to account for such differences as he best can. But it is surely a more inexcuseable error to make differences, where there are none; than to attempt to cover them, where there are. Now, as it was never pretended that, in the passages above quoted, the Hebrew word was not justly translated by the Seventy, and that the sense of both was not justly expressed by the phrase which our translators had employed in the version of the Prophets, they had no reason for adopting a different, though it were a synonymous phrase, in rendering the passage when quoted in the New. What shall we say then of their employing an expression which conveys a very different meaning?

§ 6. I SHALL produce one example, which, though no quotation, yet, having a direct reference to a promise often mentioned in the Old Testament, and made originally to the patriarchs, ought to have been interpreted in the most comprehensive way. Our translators, by not attending to this, have rendered a passage otherwise perspicuous perfectly unintelligible. Και γαρ εσμεν ευηγγελισμενοι, καθαπερ κακεινοι; in the common version, *For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them*†. He had been speaking of the Israelites under Moses in the wilderness. This sounds strangely in Christian ears. That the Gospel has been preached to us, needs no affirmation to convince us: our only difficulty is, to understand in what sense the Gospel, or religious institution of Jesus Christ, was preached to those who lived and died before his incarnation. Yet it seems here to be supposed that we all know that the Gospel was preached to them, but need to be informed that it has ever been preached to ourselves. Had it been said, *For unto them was the Gospel preached as well as unto us*, we should have discovered a meaning in the sentence, though we might have been at a loss to conceive in what respect it is defensible. But as it stands, we are no less puzzled about the meaning, than about the truth of the observation. Now, the literal and proper translation of the word ευαγγελιζομαι, in an instant, removes every difficulty. *For unto us the good tidings are published which were published to them.* What these good tidings are, is evident from the context. It is the promise of rest to God's people. It had been shown by the Apostle, in the preceding chapter, that the promise first made to the patriarchs was not, if I may so express myself, exhausted by the admission of the Israelites into the land of Canaan; that, on the contrary, we learn, from a threat in the Psalms against the rebellious, that there was still a nobler country and superior happiness men had to look for, of which the earthly Canaan was but a figure; that therefore we

* Lib. ii. Ode i.

† Heb. iv. 2.

we ought to take warning, from the example of thoſe whoſe carcaſſes fell in the wilderneſs, to beware leſt we alſo forfeit, through unbelief, that glorious inheritance, the reſt that yet remains for the people of God. Now, as the promiſes conveying the good news of reſt, were orignally made to the fathers, and to Iſrael, according to the fleſh, it was pertinent to take notice that we are equally intereſted in them, and that this good news of reſt in a happy country afterwards to be enjoyed, is declared to us as fully as ever it was to them. This ſenſe, though clearly the Apoſtle's, is totally effaced by the miſinterpretation of the word ευαγγελισμενοι. The Vulgate has, in this place, kept clear of the glaring impropriety in the Engliſh verſion. It has ſimply, *Etenim et nobis nuntiatum eſt quemadmodum et illis.* Their common way, however, is different.

§ 7. In other places, moſt modern tranſlators have been miſled, in this article, by implicitly following the Vulgate, which firſt ſet the bad example of tranſlating thoſe paſſages differently in the Old Teſtament and in the New. In the paſſage quoted from Paul, and by him from Iſaiah, Eraſmus has very well preſerved both the import of the word, and the conformity to the way in which it had been always juſtly rendered in the Prophet, *Quam ſpecioſi pedes annuntiantium pacem, annuntiantium bona!* To the ſame purpoſe Caſtalio, who had taken this way, which Eraſmus had not done, of rendering alſo the words read by our Lord in the Synagogue, *Me ad læta pauperibus nuntianda miſit.* In the other places above referred to, Caſtalio follows the common method. *Pauperes evangelium docentur.* Eraſmus, in rendering the paſſage quoted from Matthew, has endeavoured to comprehend both ways. *Pauperus lætum accipiunt evangelii nuntium.* He has in this been copied by the tranſlation of Zuric. This method is quite paraphraſtical. It does not ſavour of the ſimplicity of the evangelical ſtyle. If ευαγγελιον mean *lætum nuntium*, why did he add *evangelii?* And if it do not mean *lætum nuncium*, what had theſe words to do in the verſion? And if the Latin *evangelium* is of the ſame import with the Greek ευαγγελιον, the ſentence is a mere tautology; as if he ſhould ſay, *The poor receive the good news of glad tidings.* And if the import of the adoptive Latin word *evangelium*, which is in fact the caſe, be different from that of the Greek, which is fully interpreted by the two words *lætum nuntium, evangelii* is a mere interpolation. The words of the original are general, and have equal latitude of ſignification with the Latin *lætum nuncium*, or the Engliſh *good news.* The addition of the word *evangelii* limits the ſenſe, in a way which the Propher's expreſſion does not warrant. Nor does an interpreter's opinion concerning the completion of the prophecy (however true, nay, however certain, that opinion be) entitle him to expreſs the prediction with greater ſpeciality of meaning than has been done by his author. Eraſmus does not ſeem himſelf to have been entirely ſatisfied with this circumlocution, as he has rendered the ſame words in Luke in the common way, and in this alſo has been followed by the Tigurine tranſlator. Beza has in all the paſſages above referred to, (except that in which the Vulgate was right), followed the Vulgate, and has been followed by moſt of the early Proteſtant tranſlators.

§ 8. Some may imagine, that I am here pleading for what, on other occaſions, I have ſhown no partiality to, a tranſlation of the words, ſervilely literal or etymological. But, let it be obſerved, that I am never for tracing, in the tranſlation, the etymology of the words of the original, when the etymology does not give the juſt import of the words, according to the received uſe at the time when the ſpeeches or dialogues related were ſpoken, or when the book was compoſed. The Greek verb ευαγγελιζω, when firſt uſed by the Evangeliſts, or the Hebrew בשר *baſhar*, when uſed by the Prophets, or the Syriac סבר *ſabar*, as moſt probably uſed by our Lord and his Apoſtles, conveyed to their countrymen only one and the ſame idea, which is preciſely what the phraſe *to bring good tidings* conveys to us. The appropriation of the word to the religious inſtitution called the Goſpel, is of a later date, and has gradually ariſen out of the former uſage. When etymology and uſe perfectly coincide, as they often do, we cannot be too literal in our interpretations; when they differ, which does not ſeldom happen, the latter is to be followed, and not the former.

In ſome reſpects ſimilar, though apparently contrary, to the above objection, is that of thoſe who urge that our term *goſpel*, in its Saxon etymology is an exact counterpart to the Greek ευαγγελιον, being compounded of two words, which conjoined denote *good news.* But the only pertinent queſtion is, in this caſe, Is this the preſent meaning of the Engliſh word *Goſpel?* The firſt objectors would aſſign to the Greek word ευαγγελιον, a ſenſe which it had not during our Lord's miniſtry, but which it acquired ſoon after; the ſecond would put upon the Engliſh word *goſpel*, a ſenſe which at once had, but now has not. That this is the caſe is evident.

Should one, for example, bring us word * that an end is put to hoſtilities, and that the powers at war have at laſt agreed upon a peace, ought we in reporting this intelligence, to ſay, that one had come preaching to us the goſpel of peace? Whoever ſhould expreſs himſelf thus, would, I am afraid, be thought to talk both abſurdly and profanely. At leaſt he would

* This was written towards the end of the American war.

would be ſaid to employ a very bold and far-fetched metaphor. Yet not the metaphorical, but the proper expreſſion, in the language of the Apoſtles, would be, ευηγελισατο ημιν ειρηνην or even εκηρυξεν ημιν το ευαγγελιον της ειρηνης. Joſephus in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh war *, acquainting us that Titus ſent to his father the good news of his taking Tarichea, ſays, Τιτος δε εκπεμψας τινα των ιππεων ευαγγελιζεται τω πατρι το εργον. How would it ſound in our ears to render it, *preached to his father the goſpel of the action?* Nothing can be a ſtronger evidence that the Greek phraſes above mentioned, and the Engliſh *preached the goſpel*, are not equivalent. All, therefore, that can be concluded from the primitive import of the word *Goſpel*, in a different, though related, language, is that, in the Anglo-Saxon, not the Engliſh, verſion of the New Teſtament, the word ευαγγελιον was rightly ſo tranſlated. Certain it is, however, that the error remarked in the Engliſh verſion, runs through all the modern tranſlations, as well as the Vulgate which gave it birth, and is a remarkable inſtance of the truth of an obſervation formerly made †, that ſometimes, by conſulting other verſions, we may be confirmed in an error, inſtead of having it corrected. Indeed the old Latin tranſlation has ſerved in many things, as will appear more fully afterwards, as a model to the tranſlators in the Weſt.

§ 9. But, though the noun ευαγγελιον was equally unequivocal with the verb ευαγγελιζω, in its acceptation in the Old Teſtament, and commonly in the Evangeliſts, it muſt be owned that, from its original ſignification, it came inſenſibly afterwards to vary and receive other meanings, in the way I ſhall now attempt to explain. The word occurs very often in the New Teſtament, where, as it is a term of principal importance, its different ſignifications deſerve to be inveſtigated with the greateſt accuracy. That the radical ſignification, *good news*, is not only the moſt common, but, in ſome reſpect a concomitant of every other meaning affixed to the word, muſt be evident to every one who is converſant with the original. Yet this alluſive concomitance, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, is an advantage which cannot be obtained in a tranſlation. As uſe, which governs language, will not bend to our inclinations, we muſt change the word in the verſion, when the import of the original name is ſo far different, that the ſame term, in another language, will not anſwer; yet, by changing it, we may loſe the emphaſis, which reſults from the alluſion to the primitive and predominant application of the word. It will ſometimes happen, in a train of reaſoning, where the ſame word is uſed in the original in different, but related ſenſes, that the change of the correſponding term in the verſion will hurt perſpicuity, and yet may be neceſſary, becauſe the ſame word in another language, whoſe idiom does not admit the ſame extent of ſignification, would hurt it more.

§ 10. The firſt meaning of the word then in the New Teſtament, eſpecially in the Goſpels, is, as has been obſerved, *good news*, a ſignification which, though always implied, is not always what is chiefly intended; and therefore the word cannot, without a ſacrifice of propriety, be uniformly rendered ſo. The name, from being expreſſive of an eminent quality in the diſpenſation introduced by the Meſſiah, and from being moſt frequently applied to it, came gradually to ſerve as a name for the diſpenſation itſelf. When it is thus employed, it is in our tongue properly rendered *goſpel*. This is the ſecond meaning of the word. Of the other ſenſes which it has in Scripture, I ſhall take notice afterwards. The two above mentioned are the chief. And, firſt, I ſhall conſider the caſes wherein that which I call the literal and primitive ſignification, ought to be retained.

§ 11. First then, this ſenſe ought to be retained in the verſion, when the word ευαγγελιον is conſtrued with a noun ſerving to limit or explain its nature, as το ευαγγελιον της ειρηνης, *the good news of peace*, το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας, *the good news of the reign*. It was obſerved, on the explanation of the word βασιλεια, that the Chriſtian economy was foretold under the denomination of *the reign of God*, and *the reign of Heaven*; and I may add, in the typical language of the Pſalms, *the reign of David*. Now, there were, about the time of our Saviour's appearance, many who, from the predictions of the Prophets and ſigns of the times, waited, with pious confidence, for the conſolation of Iſrael, that is, for the coming of the Lord's Meſſiah, and the commencement of his glorious reign. This was the great ſubject of comfort to them, amidſt all the diſtreſſes and oppreſſions, perſonal or political, under which they groaned. For how erroneous ſoever the prevalent notions concerning the perſon of the Meſſiah, and the nature of his reign, were; they agreed in this, that they exhibited him as a deliverer, in whoſe time the principal grievances of the nation were to be redreſſed; and, in conſequence of this, the people looked forwards with faith and hope, but not without a mixture of impatience, to that long-deferred, as they then thought, but happy era, the miſſion and conſequent reign of the Meſſiah. Freedom to the ſlave, releaſe to the priſoner, pardon to the convict, could not be more welcome, or afford matter of greater joy, than the tidings, well authenticated, that that bleſſed period, ſpoken of in raptures by their Prophets, and

* Lib. iii. ch. 34.

† Diſſ. III. §6.

deſcribed in the moſt glowing colours of Eaſtern poetry, was at length arrived. Hence it is not improbable that, even ſome time before the birth of Jeſus, this much wiſhed event came to be denominated, by thoſe who expected it, perhaps the majority of the nation, *the good news* (being ſuch in an eminent manner), and more explicitly *the good news of the reign of God*, that is, of the new diſpenſation that would obtain under the promiſed Meſſiah.

§ 12. A NUMBER of ſuchlike phraſes, borrowed from the Prophets, and from the Pſalms, relating to this event, had become current among the people, and were adopted both by our Lord and by John his harbinger. Thus the Meſſiah himſelf is ſtyled ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *he that cometh*, not *he that ſhould come*, as it is leſs properly rendered in the common verſion, it being an abbreviation of that expreſſion of the Pſalmiſt *, *He that cometh in the name of the Lord.* Now it is manifeſt that, when firſt the Baptiſt, then our Lord himſelf, and laſtly his Apoſtles, in his lifetime, announced publicly the approach of this reign; they announced what the generality of the people would immediately, and without difficulty, apprehend. I do not mean, that they would underſtand the nature of the reign or ſpiritual dominion to be eſtabliſhed; for this is what few or none did; but that they would immediately underſtand it to relate to the acceſſion of the Meſſiah, their great deliverer, to that ſovereignty with which they had learnt from the Prophets, and from the ſcribes, that he was to be inveſted. The diſpenſation, therefore, is properly uſhered in with an authoritative call to all men to amend their lives, and prepare for the reign of the Meſſiah, the expectation and joy of God's people, juſt about to commence. Nothing, therefore, could be more ſuitable, and, though alarming to the wicked, nothing could be more conſolatory to the pious, at the time the nation was in ſubjection to a foreign and oppreſſive yoke, than ſuch ſeaſonable information. Nothing conſequently can be better accommodated to what muſt have been the ſentiments and proſpects of the people at that time, or can more accurately expreſs the full import of the original, κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας του Θεου, than this literal and plain verſion, *Proclaiming the glad tidings of the reign of God.* This conveys to us, at this moment, the ſame ideas which, in thoſe circumſtances, muſt have been conveyed by the words of the ſacred hiſtorian, into the mind of every Jewiſh reader at the time.

§ 13. ON the contrary, the expreſſion in the vulgar tranſlation, *preaching the goſpel of the kingdom of God*, muſt have been to ſuch a reader unintelligible; as even to us, when we abſtract from the familiarity occaſioned by cuſtom, which is apt to impoſe upon us, it appears both obſcure and improper. Caſtalio, in one place†, departs, if poſſible, ſtill farther from the ſenſe, rendering it *regium publicans evangelium*, "publiſhing the royal goſpel." Not to mention the futility of the term *royal*, applied in a way which renders it a mere expletive, the very ſubject publiſhed, ἡ βασιλεια, *the reign*, is juſtled out to make room for a ſplendid but unmeaning epithet. Our Lord, we find from the Evangeliſts, ſpoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and uſed thoſe names to which the reading of the Law and the Prophets, either in the original, or in the verſions then uſed, had familiarized them. Our tranſlators, and indeed moſt European tranſlators, repreſent him as uſing words which, even in their own tranſlations of the Old Teſtament, never occur, and to which, in fact, there is nothing there that correſponds in meaning. The people had all heard of the reign of the Meſſiah, to be eſtabliſhed in the latter times, and conſidered the arrival of that period as the happieſt tidings with which they could be made acquainted. But of the *Goſpel* they had never heard before. "What is this you call the Goſpel?" they would naturally aſk; "and what does *the Goſpel of a kingdom mean?*" Theſe are words to which our ears are ſtrangers. No mention is made of ſuch things in the Law, in the Prophets, or in the Pſalms.

§ 14. Now, if the terms muſt have been altogether unintelligible to Jews, they are, even to us Chriſtians, both obſcure and improper. Firſt, obſcure, becauſe indefinite. It does not appear eaſy in ſuch circumſtances, as thoſe under conſideration, to aſſign a preciſe meaning to the word *Goſpel.* We commonly underſtand by it the whole religious inſtitution of Jeſus, including both doctrines and precepts. Nothing can be plainer than that this is not the meaning of the term here. The very words which were preached or promulgated, are expreſsly mentioned, and compriſed in a ſingle ſentence: Μετανοειτε, ηγγικε γαρ ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων. Beſides, the Apoſtles, who, in our Lord's lifetime, received this commiſſion, were not yet qualified for teaching the ſyſtem of doctrine implied under the name *goſpel*, becauſe, in fact, they did not know it themſelves. They had then no notion of a Meſſiah but as a temporal prince and mighty conqueror, or of his kingdom but as a ſecular monarchy, more extenſive than, but of the ſame nature with, thoſe which had preceded, to wit, the Aſſyrian, the Perſian, the Macedonian empires, or, that which was in being at the time, the Roman. Not one of their hearers could have been more prejudiced, than the Apoſtles themſelves were at that time, againſt a ſuffering Saviour, who was to expire in agonies and infamy on the croſs. Now,

* cxviii. 26.

† Matth. iv. 23.

Now, let people but coolly reflect, and then put the queſtion to themſelves; If we ſet aſide theſe important truths, the death, and conſequently the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, his victory over the enemies of our ſalvation, and his purchaſe of ſpiritual and eternal bleſſings by his blood; of all which the Apoſtles were then ignorant, and againſt moſt of which, when firſt informed of them, they were as much prejudiced as any Phariſee, what will remain of that which we denominate the Goſpel, in contradiction to Judaiſm? The doctrine of the Goſpel is manifeſtly what the Apoſtles were not qualified to teach, till they were enlightened by the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on the day of Pentecoſt, after our Lord's aſcenſion. Nay, they were, after his reſurrection, when they knew more than formerly, expreſsly commanded, before they ſhould attempt to teach that doctrine, to wait the promiſed illumination from above*. But they had been, long before, ſufficiently qualified to announce the approach of this diſpenſation, and to warn men to forſake their ſins, and to prepare for the appearance of their Lord and King. Further, if the term *goſpel* here be rather indefinite, how does this addition, *of the kingdom*, ſerve either to illuſtrate or to limit the import of that term? And an addition, which anſwers neither of theſe purpoſes, cannot fail ſtill farther to darken it.

§ 15. But, ſecondly, that expreſſion in our language is, in thoſe inſtances, alſo improper; becauſe there is no meaning which uſe has affixed to the Engliſh word *goſpel*, that expreſſes the ſenſe of the original. And, as it has been ſhown that our term does not there ſuit the word ευαγγελιον, I mean afterwards to ſhow that the word *preaching* does not exactly convey the ſenſe of κηρυσσων. At the ſame time it is acknowledged, on the other hand, that the word ευαγγελιον is, in many places, in the Epiſtles of Paul, rendered *Goſpel*. But this is manifeſtly, as has been ſhown, a ſecondary ſenſe of later date.

§ 16. I observed, that when the word ευαγγελιον is conſtrued with a noun ſerving to limit or explain its nature, it ought to be rendered *good news*. But every regimen is not to be underſtood as ſerving this purpoſe. Thus, when it is followed with Ιησυ Χριστυ, with τυ Κυριυ, or τυ Θευ, which denote the author, it is juſtly regarded as a name for the diſpenſation, and properly rendered *Goſpel*. In the phraſe το ευαγγελιον τυ Χριστυ, not preceded by Ιησυ, the regimen may denote either the author or the ſubject. In the firſt view, it is *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, that is, inſtituted by him; in the ſecond, *the good news of the Meſſiah*, that is, concerning him. There are, perhaps, a few other caſes in which the choice may be a matter of indifference. But, in moſt caſes, the regimen aſcertains the ſenſe. Thus, το ευαγγελιον της ειρηνης † can be no other than *the good news of peace*. The addition plainly indicates the ſubject. For the ſame reaſon, το ευαγγελιον της χαριτος τυ Θευ ‡, is *the good news of the favour of God*; το ευαγγελιον της σωτηριας υμων §, *the good news of your ſalvation*. The words in the common verſion, *the goſpel of your ſalvation*, are mere words, and convey no meaning to Engliſh ears.—The ſecond caſe wherein the word always may, and commonly ſhould, be rendered *good news*, and not *goſpel*, is when it is conſtrued with κηρυσσω I *proclaim* or *publiſh*. The juſtneſs of this obſervation will be manifeſt, from what I ſhall afterwards obſerve on the import of that verb in the Goſpels and Acts.

§ 17. The third caſe is, when it clearly refers to a different ſubject from what is commonly with us denominated the Goſpel. Under this, perhaps, may be ranked ſome of the examples which alſo come under the firſt caſe mentioned. For inſtance, το ευαγγελιον της σωτηριας υμων, *the good news of your ſalvation*. For here the tidings to which the Apoſtle refers, was not the embaſſy itſelf of peace by Jeſus Chriſt; but it was the cordial reception which the Epheſians had given to that embaſſy, and which was to him who loved them, good news, becauſe a pledge of their ſalvation. Under the ſame caſe alſo, in my opinion, we ought to claſs that famous paſſage in the Apocalypſe ‖, *I ſaw another angel fly in the midſt of heaven, having the everlaſting goſpel* (ſo are the words εχοντα ευαγγελιον αιωνιον rendered in the common verſion), *to preach to them that dwell on the earth; and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, ſaying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come, and worſhip him*, &c. My reaſons are, firſt, we are expreſsly informed what the angel had to proclaim, κηρυσσειν, which is all contained in the 7th verſe, and relates to a particular event long poſterior to the firſt propagation of the Goſpel, namely, the vengeance God would take on the perſecutors of his church, expreſſed in theſe words, *The hour of his judgment is come*. The reſt of the verſe is to be underſtood merely as a warning naturally ſuggeſted by the occaſion. Nor let it be urged, that the approach of the hour of judgment looks rather like bad news than good. It frequently holds, that the tidings which to one are the moſt doleful, are to another the moſt joyous. The viſions and prophecies of that Book are all directed to the churches of Chriſt, and intended for their uſe.—To cruſh their enemies was to relieve the churches: the defeat of the one was the victory of the other. Secondly, what the angel had to promulgate, is not

* Acts, i. 4. 8. † Eph. vi. 15. ‡ Acts, xx. 24. § Eph. i. 13. ‖ xiv. 6, 7.

called το ευαγγελιον, as the word is almoſt uniformly uſed, when referring to the Chriſtian diſpenſation, but ſimply ευαγγελιον, not *the goſpel*, the inſtitution of Chriſt,—not that which is emphatically ſtyled *the good news*, but barely *good news*. It is ſtyled αιωνιον, everlaſting, with the ſame propriety, and in the ſame latitude, as things of long duration, or of permanent conſequences, are often in Scripture ſo denominated.

§ 18. AGAIN, let it be obſerved, that by the Engliſh word *Goſpel*, we do not always mean preciſely the ſame thing. The predominant ſenſe is doubtleſs the religious inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt. But this is not invariably its meaning. Early in the church the word ευαγγελιον was employed to denote, and, in one paſſage of the New Teſtament, actually denotes, the hiſtory of the life, teaching, death, and reſurrection of the Son of God. It is in this ſenſe that the four hiſtories or narratives, written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, containing memoirs of that extraordinary perſonage, have, from the earlieſt antiquity, been titled ευαγγελια, *Goſpels*. The word is thus uſed by Mark*, Αρχη του ευαγγελιου Ιησου Χριστου, *The beginning of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*. I confeſs, however, that it would not be eaſy to decide, whether this ought to be accounted part of the ſacred text, or a title afterwards prefixed (as were the names of the penmen, by ſome of the firſt tranſcribers), which may have been inadvertently admitted into the text. But whether this application be ſcriptural or not, it is very ancient, and has obtained univerſally in the church. The Engliſh word has preciſely the ſame application. It may be proper here to remark, that though the Greek word ευαγγελιον has been adopted by the Syriac interpreters, yet, in the hiſtorical part, they admit it only into the titles of the four Goſpels, in the ſenſe laſt mentioned, and into the firſt verſe of Mark's Goſpel, where the ſenſe is the ſame. Their uſe of the Greek word in theſe places is exactly ſimilar to the uſe which our tranſlators have made of the words of the Septuagint, *Geneſis* and *Exodus*, which ſerve for names to the two firſt Books of the Pentateuch, but which they have never employed in the body of the work, where the words γενεσις and εξοδος occur in that verſion. Thus in every other paſſage of the Goſpels, and Acts, ευαγγελιον is rendered בשרתא *ſabertha*, a plain Syriac word of the ſame ſignification and ſimilar origin. In this the Syriac interpreters appear to have acted more judiciouſly than the Latin, as they have been ſenſible of the impropriety of darkening ſome of the plaineſt, but moſt important declarations, by the unneceſſary introduction of an exotic term which had no meaning, or at leaſt not the proper meaning in their language. In Paul's Epiſtles, I acknowledge, they have ſeveral times adopted the Greek word; but let it be obſerved that, in theſe, the term ευαγγελιον is frequently employed in a different ſenſe. This has in part appeared already, but will be ſtill more evident from what immediately follows.

§ 19. THE fourth ſenſe of ευαγγελιον in the New-Teſtament is the miniſtry of the Goſpel. In this acceptation I find the word uſed oftener than once by the Apoſtle Paul. Thus, *God is my witneſs, whom I ſerve, with my ſpirit, in the Goſpel of his Son* †, εν τω ευαγγελιω, that is, in the miniſtry of the Goſpel, or in diſpenſing the Goſpel of his Son. This is one of the paſſages in which the Syriac interpreter has retained the original word. In another place ‡, *What is my reward then? Verily that when I preach the Goſpel, I may make the Goſpel of Chriſt, το ευαγγελιον, without charge*; that is, that the miniſtry of the Goſpel of Chriſt may not by me be rendered chargeable. This the context plainly ſhows; for this is the only expence he is here ſpeaking of. I think for perſpicuity's ſake, the word *miniſtry* ſhould have been uſed in the tranſlation, as the Engliſh name *Goſpel* hardly admits this meaning. Nor are theſe the only places wherein the word has this ſignification §.

§ 20. I OBSERVE alſo, in the Epiſtles of this Apoſtle, a fifth meaning, or at leaſt a particular application of the firſt general meaning *good news*. It ſometimes denotes, not the whole Chriſtian diſpenſation, but ſome particular doctrine or promiſe, ſpecially meriting that denomination. In this ſenſe Paul uſes the word, writing to the Galatians ‖. The particular doctrine to which he gives the pertinent appellation ευαγγελιον, *good news*, is the free admiſſion of the Gentiles into the church of Chriſt, without ſubjecting them to circumciſion, and the other ceremonies of the law. This, conſidering the Jewiſh prejudices at that time, accounts for the reſerve which he uſed at Jeruſalem, where, by his own repreſentation, he imparted privately to the diſciples of chief diſtinction, and conſequently of moſt enlarged knowledge and ſentiments, that doctrine which he publicly proclaimed in Gentile countries. I think it is this which the Apoſtle ſometimes, by way of diſtinction, denominates *his Goſpel*. For, though there was no diſcordancy in the doctrine taught by the different Apoſtles, yet to him and Barnabas, the Apoſtles of the uncircumciſion, it was ſpecially committed to announce every where among the heathen, God's gracious purpoſe of receiving them, uncircumciſed as they were, into

* i. 1. † Rom. i. 9. ‡ 1 Cor. ix. 18. § See 2 Cor. viii 18. and Phil. iv. 15. ‖ ii. 2.

into the church of Chriſt. Accordingly, as he proceeds in his argument *, the Goſpel, or good news, ευαγγελιον, ſent to the Gentiles, is expreſsly contraſted with that ſent to the Jews.

This ſeems alſo to be the ſenſe of the word in another paſſage †, where what he calls το ευαγγελιον μου, he deſcribes as μυστηριον χρονοις αιωνιοις σεσιγημενον, *kept ſecret for ages*, but now made known to all nations for the obedience of the faith. For, in this manner, he oftener than once ſpeaks of the call of the Gentiles. In all ſuch paſſages, it is better to retain the general term *good news* in the verſion. This appellation is, in ſome reſpect, evidently applicable to them all, whereas the term *Goſpel* is never thus underſtood in our language.

PART III.

Of the Phraſe η καινη διαθηκη.

ANOTHER title, by which the religious inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt is ſometimes denominated, is η καινη διαθηκη, which is almoſt always, in the writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, rendered by our tranſlators *the New Teſtament*. Yet the word διαθηκη by itſelf is, except in a very few places, always there rendered not *Teſtament*, but *Covenant*. It is the Greek word whereby the Seventy have uniformly tranſlated the Hebrew בריה *berith*, which our tranſlators in the Old Teſtament have invariably rendered *Covenant*. That the Hebrew term correſponds much better to the Engliſh word *Covenant*, though not in every caſe perfectly equivalent, than to *Teſtament*, there can be no queſtion: at the ſame time it muſt be owned that the word διαθηκη, in claſſical uſe, is more frequently rendered *Teſtament*. The proper Greek word for Covenant is συνθηκη, which is not found in the New-Teſtament, and occurs only thrice in the Septuagint. It is never there employed for rendering the Hebrew *berith*, though, in one place, it is ſubſtituted for a term nearly ſynonymous. That the Scriptural ſenſe of the word διαθηκη is more fitly expreſſed by our term *Covenant*, will not be doubted by any body who conſiders the conſtant application of the Hebrew word ſo rendered in the Old Teſtament, and of the Greek word, in moſt places at leaſt, where it is uſed in the New. What has led tranſlators, ancient and modern, to render it *Teſtament*, is, I imagine, the manner wherein the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews argues ‡, in alluſion to the claſſical acceptation of the term. But however much it was neceſſary to give a different turn to the expreſſion in that paſſage, in order to make the author's argument as intelligible to the Engliſh, as it is in the original to the Greek reader; this was not a ſufficient reaſon for giving a verſion to the word, in other places, that neither ſuits the context, nor is conformable to the eſtabliſhed uſe of the term, in the ſacred writings.

§ 2. THE term *New* is added to diſtinguiſh it from the *Old Covenant*, that is, the diſpenſation of Moſes. I cannot help obſerving here by the way, that often the language of theological ſyſtems, ſo far from aſſiſting us to underſtand the language of holy writ, tends rather to miſlead us. The two Covenants are always in Scripture the two diſpenſations, or religious inſtitutions; that under Moſes is the *Old*, that under the Meſſiah is the *New*. I do not deny that in the latitude wherein the term is uſed in holy writ, the command under the ſanction of death which God gave to Adam in Paradiſe, may, like the ordinance of circumciſion, with ſufficient propriety be termed a *Covenant*; but it is pertinent to obſerve that it is never ſo denominated in Scripture; and that, when mention is made in the Epiſtles, of the two Covenants, the *Old* and the *New*, or the firſt and the ſecond (for there are two ſo called by way of eminence), there appears no reference to any thing that related to Adam. In all ſuch places Moſes and Jeſus are contraſted, the Jewiſh economy and the Chriſtian, Mount Sinai in Arabia, whence the law was promulged, and Mount Sion in Jeruſalem, where the Goſpel was firſt publiſhed.

§ 3. IT is proper to obſerve further that, from ſignifying the two religious diſpenſations, they came ſoon to denote the books, wherein what related to theſe diſpen-

* Gal. ii. 7. † Rom. xvi. 25. ‡ ix. 16, 17.

diſpenſations was contained; the ſacred writings of the Jews being called ἡ παλαια διαθηκη, and the writings ſuperadded by the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, ἡ καινη διαθηκη. We have one example in Scripture, of this uſe of the former appellation. The Apoſtle ſays*, ſpeaking of his countrymen, *Until this day remaineth the veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Teſtament* επι τη αναγνωσει της παλαιας διαθηκης. The word in this application is always rendered in our language *Teſtament*. We have in this followed the Vulgate, as moſt modern tranſlators alſo have done. In the Geneva French, the word is rendered both ways in the title, that the one may ſerve for explaining the other, *Le nouveau Teſtament*, c'eſt à dire *La nouvelle alliance*, &c. in which they copied Beza, who ſays *Teſtamentum novum*, ſive *Fœdus novum*. That the ſecond rendering of the word is the better verſion, is unqueſtionable; but the title appropriated by cuſtom to a particular book, is on the ſame footing with a proper name, which is hardly conſidered as a ſubject of criticiſm. Thus we call Cæſar's Diary, *Cæſar's Commentaries*, from their Latin name, though very different in meaning from the Engliſh word.

PART IV.

Of the Name ὁ Χριστος.

THE only other term neceſſary to be examined here, is ὁ χριστος, the Meſſiah, or *the Chriſt*, in the Engliſh rendered, according to the etymology of the word, *the anointed*; for ſo both the Hebrew משיח, *Meſhiach*, and the Greek χριστος ſignify; and from the ſound of theſe are formed our names *Meſſiah* and *Chriſt*. What firſt gave riſe to the term, was the ceremony of anointing, by which the kings and the high-prieſts of God's people, and ſometimes the prophets †, were conſecrated and admitted to the exerciſe of their holy functions: for all theſe functions were accounted holy among the Iſraelites. As this conſecration was conſidered as adding a ſacredneſs to their perſons, it ſerved as a guard againſt violence from the reſpect had to religion. Its efficacy this way was remarkably exemplified in David. By this conſideration principally, as he acknowledges, he was reſtrained from avenging himſelf on Saul his enemy, who ſought his life, when he had it in his power to kill him. *The Lord forbid* ‡, ſaid he, *that I ſhould do this thing unto my maſter, the Lord's anointed, to ſtretch forth mine hand againſt him, ſeeing he is anointed of the Lord.* The word here tranſlated *anointed* is, as in other places, in Hebrew *Meſſiah*, and in the Greek of the Seventy, *Chriſt*. It was a term therefore, in its original uſe, applicable to all the ſucceſſion of kings and high-prieſts, good and bad, of the people of Iſrael.

§ 2. BUT as the king and the high-prieſt were the heads of the whole nation, the one in civil, the other in religious matters, the term *anointed*, that is *Meſſiah* or *Chriſt*, might, not improbably, ſerve, by a figure, to denote the chief, head or principal of any claſs or people. So thinks the learned Grotius. Thus the high-prieſt is ſometimes diſtinguiſhed from ordinary prieſts by the title *the anointed prieſt*; in the Septuagint ὁ ἱερευς ὁ χριστος; though this, I own, is not a proof of the point, ſince he was literally ſo diſtinguiſhed from the reſt §. But that the word is ſometimes applied, when, in the literal ſenſe, no anointing had been uſed, cannot be queſtioned. In this way it is applied to Cyrus the Perſian monarch by the Prophet Iſaiah ‖, *Thus ſaith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus*: yet Houbigant, differing from his uſual manner, renders the words, *de unctio ſuo Cyro*. But whether the import of the expreſſion be, that Cyrus was a chief among kings, a moſt eminent ſovereign, as Grotius ſeems to imagine, or that he was ſelected of God for the reſtoration of Judah, and the rebuilding of the temple of Jeruſalem, the only temple dedicated to the true God, may be made a queſtion. For my part, I am

* 2 Cor. iii. 14. † 1 Kings, xix. 16. ‡ 1 Sam. xxiv. 6.

§ The ſons of Aaron were indeed all anointed, in their father's lifetime, by the expreſs command of God; but it does not appear, that this practice deſcended to other ordinary prieſts.

‖ Iſ. xlv. 1.

am inclinable to think that it is rather this latter interpretation which conveys the Prophet's idea, and the meaning intended by the Spirit of God. And to this interpretation the context entirely agrees. The word was alſo employed to denote thoſe ſpecially favoured of God, as were the Patriarchs Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; concerning whom he is repreſented by the Pſalmiſt*, as having ſaid, *Touch not mine anointed.* The word is in the plural number, των χριστων μου, in the Vulgate *Chriſtos meos*, which, in our idiom, is not diſtinguiſhed from the ſingular. Now there is no ground from Scripture to believe that any of them was in the literal ſenſe anointed.

§ 3. But the moſt eminent uſe and application of the word is when it is employed as the title of that ſublime Perſonage typified and predicted from the beginning, who was to prove, in the moſt exalted ſenſe, the Redeemer and Lord of God's people. He is ſpoken of by the Prophets under ſeveral characters, and, amongſt others, under this *of God's anointed*, the Meſſiah or the Chriſt. Thoſe of the Prophets, who ſeem more eſpecially to have appropriated this title, formerly more common, to the Mediator of the New Covenant, were the royal Prophet David†, Iſaiah ‡, and Daniel §. The firſt repreſents him as anointed of God King of God's heritage, the ſecond as ſet apart and conſecrated to be the Meſſenger of good tidings to the inhabitants of the earth, the third as appointed to make expiation for the ſins of the people.

§ 4. It deſerves to be remarked, that in the Engliſh tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, the word is always rendered *anointed*, to whomſoever applied, except in the two verſes of Daniel quoted in the margin, where it is tranſlated *Meſſiah*. In the New Teſtament, the correſponding Greek word is always rendered *Chriſt*, and commonly without the article. In this our interpreters have been ſo uniform, that they have even employed the word *Chriſt*, where the paſſage is a quotation and literal tranſlation from the Old Teſtament, in which the Hebrew word, though perfectly equivalent, had been by themſelves rendered *anointed*. Thus‖, *the rulers were gathered together againſt the Lord and againſt his Chriſt*, κατα του Χριστου αυτου. The words are quoted from the ſecond Pſalm, where they had ſaid, *againſt his anointed*. The change here is the more remarkable, as there is a plain reference to the meaning of the word in the very next ſentence: *For of a truth againſt thy holy child Jeſus, whom thou haſt anointed,* ον εχρισας, *both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Iſrael, were gathered together.*

§ 5. In the Vulgate, in all the places of the Old Teſtament above referred to, it is tranſlated *Chriſtus*. So it is alſo in Houbigant, except where it is applied to Cyrus, as mentioned § 2. Whereas, in regard to Cyrus, it is in the Vulgate, *Hæc dicit Dominus Chriſto meo Cyro.* The ſame appellation is alſo given to King Saul, *Dixitque David ad viros ſuos, Propitius ſit mihi Dominus, ne faciam hanc rem domino meo, Chriſto Domini, ut mittam manum meam in eum, quia Chriſtus Domini eſt.* In the Pſalms, *Nolite tangere Chriſtos meos*, and *adverſus Dominum et adverſus Chriſtum ejus.* In Daniel alſo the word is in the ſame way rendered. Here indeed, and in the laſt-mentioned paſſage from the Pſalms, as no Chriſtian can well doubt the reference to the Meſſiah, there is not ſo great an appearance of impropriety; yet, when applied to the high-prieſt, they have not ſaid *Chriſtus*, but *unctus*, giving the import of the word as it was literally applicable to him. Otherwiſe the term *Chriſtus* might have been uſed at leaſt as properly of the high-prieſt, who was, in one reſpect, a figure of our Lord, as either of a heathen prince, or even of a bad king of Iſrael. All the other Latin tranſlators, except *Leo de Juda*, if I remember right, uſe *unctus*, not only in ſpeaking of the prieſt, but alſo in relation to Cyrus and Saul; and wherever they have not obſerved a direct reference to the Lord Jeſus. *Leo*, in the paſſage above quoted from Samuel, uſes both words, *Meſſias* and *unctus*, in relation to Saul, where he probably introduces the latter word for explaining the former. *Servet me Dominus, ne rem iſtam deſignem contra dominum meum meſſiam Domini, ut ſcilicit inferam ei manum; eſt enim unctus Domini.* To Cyrus alſo he applies the word *meſſias*. In Daniel, Leo, Caſtalio, and Houbigant, all uſe the word *Meſſias*: Junius uſes *Chriſtus* with the Vulgate both there and in the ſecond Pſalm, in which laſt mentioned place Leo alſo uſes *Chriſtus*. About other modern tranſlations it is not neceſſary here to enquire. It is ſufficient to obſerve that at, and for many years before, the time of our Lord's appearing, the term was underſtood to denote the great Deliverer and Prince whom God had promiſed by his Prophets, to ſend for the comfort and redemption of his people.

§ 6. Let us now conſider a little the uſe of the term in the New Teſtament. If we were to judge by the common verſion, or even by moſt verſions into modern tongues, we ſhould conſider the word as rather a proper name than an appellative, or name of office, and ſhould think of it only as a ſurname given to our Lord. Our tranſlators have contributed greatly to this miſtake, by very ſeldom prefixing the article before *Chriſt*, though it is rarely wanting in the original. The word *Chriſt* was at firſt as much an appellative as the word *baptiſt* was, and the one was as regularly accompanied with

* Pſal. cv. 15. 1 Chr. xvi. 22. † Pſal. ii. 2. ‡ Iſaiah, xli. 1, &c. § Dan. ix. 25, 26. ‖ Acts, iv. 26, 27.

with the article as the other. Yet our tranſlators, who always ſay *the baptiſt*, have, one would think, ſtudiouſly avoided ſaying *the Chriſt*. This may appear to ſuperficial readers an inconſiderable difference; but the addition of the article will be found, when attended to, of real conſequence, for conveying the meaning in Engliſh, with the ſame perſpicuity and propriety with which it is conveyed in Greek. So much virtue there is in the article, which, in our idiom, is never prefixed to the name of a man, though it is invariably prefixed to a name of office (unleſs where ſome pronoun, or other appropriating expreſſion, renders it unneceſſary), that without it the ſenſe is always darkened, and ſometimes marred. Thus, in ſuch expreſſions as theſe, *This Jeſus whom I preach unto you is Chriſt* *: *Paul teſtified to the Jews that Jeſus was Chriſt* †: *Shewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was Chriſt*‡: the unlearned reader forms no diſtinct apprehenſion, as the common application of the words leads him uniformly to conſider Jeſus and Chriſt, as no other than the name and the ſurname of the ſame perſon. It would have conveyed to ſuch a reader preciſely the ſame meaning to have ſaid, *Paul teſtified to the Jews that Chriſt was Jeſus*; and ſo of the reſt. The article alone, therefore, in ſuch caſes, adds conſiderable light to the expreſſion; yet no more than what the words of the hiſtorian manifeſtly convey to every reader who underſtands his language. It ſhould be, therefore, *Paul teſtified to the Jews that Jeſus was the Chriſt*, or the Meſſiah, &c. Many other examples might be brought to the ſame purpoſe; but theſe are ſufficient.

§ 7. But it may be aſked, Is the word *Chriſt* then never to be underſtood in the New Teſtament as a proper name; but always as having a direct reference to the office or dignity? I anſwer that, without queſtion, this word, though originally an appellative, came at length, from the frequency of application to one individual, and only to one, to ſupply the place of a proper name. What would contribute to haſten this effect, was the commonneſs of the name *Jeſus* among the Jews at that time, which rendered an addition neceſſary for diſtinguiſhing the perſon. The remark of Grotius is not without foundation, that, in proceſs of time, the name *Jeſus* was very much dropped, and *Chriſt*, which had never been uſed before as the proper name of any perſon, and was, for that very reaſon, a better diſtinction, was ſubſtituted for it; inſomuch that, among the heathen, our Lord came to be more known by the latter than by the former. This uſe ſeems to have begun ſoon after his aſcenſion. In his life-time, it does not appear that the word was ever uſed in this manner; nay, the contrary is evident from ſeveral paſſages of the Goſpels. But the evangeliſts wrote ſome years after the period above mentioned, and therefore, the more perfectly to notify the ſubject of their hiſtory, they adopted the practice common among Chriſtians at that time, which was to employ the word as a ſurname for the ſake of diſtinction. This was eſpecially proper in the beginning of their narrative, for aſcertaining the perſon whoſe hiſtory they were to write. Thus Matthew begins, *The lineage of Jeſus Chriſt* §: and a little after ||, *Now the birth of Jeſus Chriſt happened thus*. Mark in like manner ¶, *The beginning of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*. In all the three places it is Ιησυ Χριστε, Jeſus *Chriſt*, not Ιησυ του Χριστου Jeſus the Chriſt, or the Meſſiah.

Matthew and Mark, as was juſt now obſerved, name him ſo, in introducing their Goſpels; but it deſerves to be remarked that they do not afterwards, in their hiſtory, either name him ſo themſelves, or mention this name as given him by any of his contemporaries: nay, the very profeſſion of Peter, and the doubts raiſed by his enemies in regard to his being ὁ χριστος, *the Meſſiah*, or *the Chriſt*, and his never being named familiarly, either by them or by others, during that period, Ιησους Χριστος, but ſimply Ιησους or ὁ Ιησους, which occurs in the four Goſpels upwards of five hundred times, put it beyond doubt, that the word was never applied to him as a proper name, whilſt he remained on this earth. It was at that time always underſtood as the denomination of the dignity or office to which ſome believed him entitled, others diſbelieved, and many doubted. The names uſed both by Matthew and by Mark, in the beginning of their Goſpels, and by John in the introductory part of his**; for Luke does not adopt this manner in his Goſpel; ſhow only the uſage which obtained at the time when they wrote, but not when their Lord was living upon the earth. In the laſt of the four Goſpels, he is in one place †† repreſented as calling himſelf Jeſus Chriſt in an addreſs to God; but this is ſo ſingular, that I cannot help ſuſpecting an accidental omiſſion of the article; and that the clauſe muſt have ſtood originally ὁν απεστειλας Ιησουν τον χριστον, *Jeſus the Meſſiah whom thou haſt ſent*. But whatever be in this, we are warranted to conclude, from the uniform tenour of all the Goſpels, that χριστος, in this paſſage, muſt be underſtood as the name of his office. Now, for the very ſame reaſon for which our tranſlators have rendered ὁ βαπτιστης, uniformly *the baptiſt*, with the article, they ought to have rendered ὁ χριστος, *the Chriſt*, or *the Meſſiah*, with the article. By not doing it, they have thrown much obſcurity on ſome paſſages, and weakened others.

§ 8. Though in the Epiſtles it may be ſometimes difficult, but is ſeldom of conſequence, to determine whether Χριστος be an appellative or a proper name, there

* Acts, xvii. 3. † xviii. 5. ‡ 28. § i. 1. || 18. ¶ i. 1. ** i. 17. †† John, xvii. 3.

there is rarely in the Goſpels, with which I am here more immediately concerned, any difficulty that can retard an attentive and judicious critic. Such will be ſenſible, that whatever was the caſe afterwards, the word Chriſt, during the period comprehended in the Goſpel hiſtory, was employed ſolely to expreſs the office or dignity wherewith he was inveſted, as the Apoſtle of God, for the redemption of the world. Accordingly, when it is uſed in the Goſpels, the ſtreſs of the ſentence lies commonly on the ſignification of that word. Peter, in his ſolemn confeſſion, ſays*, *We believe and are ſure that thou art* ὁ χριστος, *the Chriſt, the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God.* Here the ſubſtance of his declared belief lies much in the import of this term. Our tranſlators have conſidered this as ſo evident that, in the parallel paſſages in other Goſpels, they have departed from their ordinary practice, and rendered it *the Chriſt*, and in this paſſage, leſs properly *that Chriſt*. In other places where propriety equally required the article, they have not given it.

Of ſeveral which might be quoted, I ſhall mention only one example in the queſtion put by Jeſus to the Phariſees: † Τι ὑμιν δοκει περι τυ χριστυ, which our tranſlators render, *What think ye of Chriſt?* The word uſed in this manner, without any article definite or indefinite, or any other term to aſcertain the meaning, muſt, in our idiom, be a proper name; and, as here propoſed by Jeſus, can be underſtood no otherwiſe by an unlearned reader than as intended for drawing forth their ſentiments concerning himſelf. To ſuch the queſtion muſt appear identical with *What think ye of Jeſus?* A name of office is never uſed in ſo indiſtinct a manner. For example, we may ſay indefinitely, *What think ye of a king?* or definitely, *What think ye of the king?* but never, *What think ye of king?* unleſs we ſpeak of one whoſe name is *King*. Yet an appellative may be uſed without an article when the name is ſubjoined, becauſe this ſerves equally with the article to aſcertain the meaning, as thus, *What think ye of king Solomon?* In the place above quoted, there was therefore the ſtrongeſt reaſon for following more cloſely the original, as it was evidently our Lord's purpoſe to draw forth their ſentiments, not concerning himſelf, the individual who put the queſtion to them, and whom he knew they conſidered as an impoſtor, but, in general, concerning the quality of that Perſonage whom, under the title of Meſſiah, they themſelves expected.

§ 9. ONE mark of diſtinction, therefore, whereby the title χριστος may be diſcriminated from the name, is its being attended with the article. I do not mention this, however, as holding invariably, but very generally. When the word is in the vocative, by the idiom of the language, there can be no article; in that caſe, therefore, we muſt be directed ſolely by the ſenſe. Thus, in προφητευσον ἡμιν χριστε‡, this term muſt mean *Meſſiah*, as the intended ridicule is entirely founded on their aſcribing that character to one in his wretched circumſtances. Another exception is, when it is joined to ſome other title, as Χριστος Κυριος §, Χριστος βασιλευς‖; and ſometimes, but more rarely, when conſtrued with a pronoun, as εαν τις αυτον ὁμολογηση χριστον¶, where the ſenſe renders the meaning indubitable. In a few places in regard to this, as well as to other terms, there is an ellipſis of the article, where the moſt common uſage would require it. Of this ὁτι χριστος ει**, is an inſtance.

I know it may be objected to the article as a criterion, that in Greek it is not unuſual to prefix it to the proper names of perſons. Accordingly, in naming our Lord, Ιησους and ὁ Ιησους are uſed indifferently. For this reaſon, I do not lay much ſtreſs on this diſtinction, unleſs it be confirmed by the connection. In the Epiſtles, it is plain, that the term is uſed familiarly as a proper name, and conſequently when alone, and not appearing from the context to be emphatical, may be properly rendered as a name, whether it have the article or not. But when it immediately follows Ιησους, the article not intervening, it can hardly be interpreted otherwiſe. Let it be obſerved that, in ſcriptural uſe, when a perſon has two names, the article, if uſed at all, is prefixed to the firſt name, and never inſerted between them, unleſs when ſome other word, as λεγομενος, is added by way of explanation. Thus it is Πορκιος φηστος, Σεργιος Παυλος, Ιουδας Ισκαριωτης, Ποντιος Πιλατος, and Σιμων Πετρος. Indeed, where a perſon is diſtinguiſhed by adding an epithet rather than a ſurname, denoting the place of his birth, or of his reſidence, the article is conſtantly prefixed to the adjective. Thus it is always Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνη, literally *Mary the Magdalene*, that is, *of Magdala*, a city on the lake of Genneſaret; and Ιησους ὁ Ναζαραιος, Jeſus *the Nazarene*, or *of Nazareth*.

When the article, therefore, is inſerted between the words Ιησους and Χριστος, there is reaſon to conſider the latter as uſed emphatically, and pointing directly to his office. In many places in the Epiſtles, perhaps in a very few in the Goſpels, it may be regarded as a matter of indifference, in which of the two ways the term is tranſlated. Thus, in the firſt chapter of Matthew††, Ιησους ὁ λεγομενος Χριστος, may be either Jeſus, *who is called Chriſt*, that being a ſurname which, when Matthew wrote, was frequently given him, or *Jeſus who is called* (that is *accounted*) *Meſſiah*. I have, in my verſion, preferred the ſecond interpretation; as, in the verſe immediately following, we cannot underſtand

* John, vi. 69. † Matth. xxii. 42. ‡ Matth. xxvi. 68. § Luke ii. 11. ¶ xxiii. 2.
¶ John, ix, 22. ** Mark, ix. 41. †† 11.

otherwiſe, the words ιωσ τυ χριστυ, with the article, and without the name ιησυ prefixed If ſo, ὁ λεγομενος χριστος is mentioned to prepare us for this application of the title. Beſides, the ſame phraſe occurs again in this Goſpel*, as uſed by Pilate at a time when it was never applied to our Lord but by his followers, and that ſolely as the denomination of his office. So much for the method whereby we may diſcover when this word is emphatical, and when it is merely a ſurname.

§ 10. It is proper now to enquire, in the laſt place, which of the three terms, *Meſſiah*, *Chriſt*, or *Anointed*, is the moſt proper to be applied in an Engliſh verſion. The word *Anointed* is indeed an Engliſh word, and is, beſides, in reſpect of the idea it conveys, expreſſive of the etymological import of the Hebrew and Greek terms. But, notwithſtanding theſe advantages, it is not ſo proper in this caſe for being uſed in a verſion. For firſt, the original term had early been employed, as we have ſeen, without any regard to the literal ſignification; and in the ordinary application of it, in our Lord's time, little or no attention ſeems to have been given to the circumſtance of unction, which gave riſe to the name. Though the word *Anointed*, therefore, expreſſes the primitive import of the Hebrew name, it does not convey the meaning in which it was then univerſally underſtood. It was conſidered ſolely as the well known title of an extraordinary office, to which there was nothing ſimilar, amongſt any other people. The original name, therefore, agreeably to what was concluded in a former diſcourſe†, ought to be retained. Secondly, it deſerves ſome notice, that the word, both in Hebrew and in Greek, is a ſubſtantive, and therefore, in point of form, well adapted for a name of office, being ſuſceptible of the ſame variety, in number and mode of conſtruction, with other ſubſtantives; the Engliſh word *Anointed* is a participle and indeclinable, and ſo far from being adapted for the name of an office, that it is grammatically no more than the attributive of ſome name, either expreſſed or underſtood.

§ 11. As to the other two words, *Meſſiah* and *Chriſt*, it may be thought a matter of indifference which of them ſhould be preferred. The following are the reaſons which have determined me to give the preference to the former. Firſt, our Lord's own miniſtry was only amongſt his countrymen the Jews, to whom the title of *Meſſiah* was familiar. With them, whereſoever diſperſed, it is conſidered as the title of that dignity to this day, and is accordingly naturalized in every language that they ſpeak. We never hear of the *Jewiſh Chriſt*, it is always the *Jewiſh Meſſiah*. When the Engliſh tranſlators found it convenient, in tranſlating Daniel, to adopt a term more appropriated than the general word *anointed*, they choſe the Hebrew term *Meſſiah*, in preference to the Greek; and it is ſurely proper, when the meaning of a word in the New Teſtment is manifeſtly the ſame, to conform, as much as poſſible, to the language of the Old. That the word *Meſſiah* was conſtantly uſed in Paleſtine, in our Lord's time, is evident from the two paſſages in the Goſpel of John‡, where, after mentioning it as the title in current uſe both with Jews and with Samaritans, he adds the explanation in Greek. Secondly, *Meſſiah* is, even in Engliſh uſe, much more familiar, as the name of the office, than the term *Chriſt*, which is now univerſally underſtood as a proper name of our Saviour. The word *Meſſiah*, on the contrary, is never employed, and conſequently never underſtood, as a proper name. It is invariably a name of office; and even this circumſtance, however ſlight it may appear, has a conſiderable influence on perſpicuity.

§ 12. I shall only add here, before I conclude this ſubject, that the word χριστος is frequently uſed by Paul as a trope, denoting ſometimes the Chriſtian ſpirit and temper, as when he ſays, *My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Chriſt be formed in you* §. Sometimes the Chriſtian doctrine, *But ye have not ſo learned Chriſt* ‖: And in one place at leaſt, the Chriſtian church, *For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: ſo alſo is Chriſt* ¶. In theſe caſes it is better to retain the name *Chriſt*, as uſed hitherto in the verſion.

§ 13. Some have thought that the expreſſion ὁ υιος τυ ανθρωπυ, *the ſon of man*, which our Lord always uſes when he ſpeaks of himſelf in the third perſon, is alſo a title which was then underſtood to denote the Meſſiah. But of this there does not appear ſufficient evidence. The only paſſage of moment that is pleaded in ſupport of it, is from the Prophet Daniel, who ſays, that he ſaw in the night viſions, *one like the ſon of man come, with the clouds of heaven, to the ancient of days, and that there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom***. There can be no reaſonable doubt, from the deſcription given, that the Meſſiah is meant. But this is not notified by any of the terms or phraſes taken ſeparately; it is the reſult of the whole. Nothing appears to be pointed out by this ſingle circumſtance, *one like the ſon of man*, or *like a ſon of man* (as it ought to have been rendered, neither term being in *ſtatu emphatico*, which in Chaldee ſupplies the article), but that he would be a human, not an angelical, or any other kind of being: for, in the oriental idiom, *ſon of man* and *man*, are terms equivalent.

The four monarchies which were to precede that of the

* xxvii. 17. 22.
‖ Eph. iv. 20.
† Diſſ. II. § 5.
¶ 1 Cor. xii. 12.
‡ i. 42. iv. 25.
** Dan. vii. 13, 14.
§ Gal. iv. 19.

the Meſſiah, the Prophet had, in the foregoing part of the chapter, deſcribed under the figure of certain beaſts, as emblems ſeverally of the prodominant character of each; the firſt under the figure of a lion, the ſecond under that of a bear, the third of a leopard, and the fourth of a monſter more terrible than any of theſe. This kingdom, which God himſelf was to erect, is contradiſtinguiſhed to all the reſt, by the figure of a man, in order to denote that whereas violence, in ſome ſhape or other, would be the principal means by which thoſe merely ſecular kingdoms would be eſtabliſhed, and terror the principal motive by which ſubmiſſion would be enforced, it would be quite otherwiſe in that ſpiritual kingdom to be erected by the ancient of days, wherein every thing would be ſuited to man's rational and moral nature; affection would be the prevailing motive to obedience, and perſuaſion the means of producing it; or, to uſe the Scripture expreſſion, we ſhould be drawn *with cords of a man, with bands of love.*

Had the Prophet uſed *man* inſtead of *ſon of man*, could one have concluded, that the word *man* was intended as a diſtinguiſhing title of the Meſſiah? It will hardly be pretended. Yet the argument would have been the ſame; for the terms are ſynonymous.

There are two phraſes by which this may be expreſſed in Hebrew, בן אדם *ben adam*, and בן איש *ben iſh*. When theſe two are contraſted to each other, the former denotes one of low degree, the latter one of ſuperior rank. Thus *bene adam ubene iſh* are in the Pſalms * rightly rendered in the common verſion *low and high*. The firſt *bene adam* is, in the Septuagint, tranſlated γηγενεις, in the Vulgate, *terrigenæ*, earth-born, or ſons of earth, in alluſion to the derivation of the word *adam*, man, from a word ſignifying ground or *earth*. The ſame *ben adam*, is the common appellation by which God addreſſes the Prophet Ezekiel, which is rendered by the Seventy υιε ανθρωπε, and frequently occurs in that Book. *The ſon of man*, therefore, was an humble title, in which nothing was claimed, but what was enjoyed in common with all mankind. In the Syriac verſion of the New Teſtament, it often occurs, where the term in the Greek is ſimply ανθρωπος, *man*.

That it was never underſtood by the people in our Lord's time, as a title of the Meſſiah, or even a title of dignity, is manifeſt from ſeveral conſiderations. In the firſt place, though Jeſus commonly takes it to himſelf, it is never given him by the Evangeliſts, in ſpeaking of him. He is never addreſſed with this title by others, whether diſciples or ſtrangers. Several honourable compellations were given him, by thoſe who applied for relief, as, κυριε, διδασκαλε, rabbi; ſometimes he is addreſſed *ſon of David*, ſometimes *ſon of God*, and on one occaſion he is called *he who cometh in the name of the Lord.* The two laſt titles may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to imply an acknowledgment of him as Meſſiah. Now, if the title *ſon of man* had been thought, even in any degree, reſpectful from others, we ſhould certainly have had ſome examples of it in his lifetime. Further, our Lord was in the practice of denominating himſelf in this manner, at the very time that he prohibited his diſciples from acquainting any man that he was the Meſſiah. What purpoſe could this prohibition have anſwered, if the title he aſſumed in the hearing of every body, was underſtood to be of the ſame import? It is urged further, that this phraſe is uſed in the Apocalypſe †, in deſcribing the viſion which the Apoſtle John had of his Maſter. The anſwer is the ſame with that given to the argument founded on Daniel's viſion. Firſt, the phraſe is not entirely the ſame with that by which Jeſus diſtinguiſhes himſelf in the Goſpel. Our Lord calls himſelf ὁ υιος του ανθρωπου, *the ſon of man*, John ſays, ὁμοιον υιω ανθρωπου, without any article, *one like a ſon of man*, that is, *in the human form.* It is indeed evident that he is ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt; but this is what we gather from the whole deſcription and context, and not from this circumſtance alone.

§ 14. BUT, whatever be in this, there are ſeveral titles which, in the writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, are peculiarly applied to our Lord, though they do not often occur I have already mentioned ὁ ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριου, and ὁ υιος Δαβιδ. Add to theſe ὁ αγιος του Θεου, *the ſaint*, or *the holy one of God*, ὁ εκλεκτος του Θεου, *the elect*, or *the choſen one of God*, both expreſſions borrowed from the Prophets. Now, though theſe terms are in the plural number ſuſceptible of an application to others, both angels and men; they are, in the New Teſtament, when in the ſingular number, and accompanied with the article, evidently appropriated to the Meſſiah.

* Pſal. xlix. 2.

† Rev. i. 13.

DISSERTATION THE SIXTH.

Inquiry into the Differences in the Import of ſome Words commonly thought ſynonymous.

SEVERAL words in the New Teſtament conſidered by our tranſlators as ſynonymous, and commonly rendered by the ſame Engliſh word, are not really ſynonymous, though their ſignifications may have affinity, and though ſometimes they may be uſed indiſcriminately. I ſhall exemplify this remark in a few inſtances of words which occur in the Goſpels.

PART I.

Διαβολος Δαιμων, *and* Δαιμονιον.

THE firſt of this kind, on which I intend to make ſome obſervations, are διαβολος, δαιμων, and δαιμονιον, all rendered in the common tranſlation almoſt invariably *devil*. The word διαβολος, in its ordinary acceptatation, ſignifies *calumniator*, *traducer*, *falſe accuſer*, from the verb διαβαλλειν, to calumniate, &c. Though the word is ſometimes, both in the Old Teſtament and in the New, applied to men and women of this character, it is, by way of emminence, employed to denote that apoſtate angel, who is exhibited to us, particularly in the New Teſtament, as the great enemy of God and man. In the two firſt chapters of Job, it is the word in the Septuagint, by which the Hebrew שטן *Satan* or *adverſary*, is tranſlated. Indeed the Hebrew word in this application, as well as the Greek, has been naturalized in moſt modern languages. Thus we ſay indifferently *the devil* or *Satan*; only the latter has more the appearance of a proper name, as it is not attended with the article. There is this difference between the import of ſuch terms, as occurring in their native tongues, and as modernized in tranſlations. In the former they always retain ſomewhat of their primitive meaning, and, beſide indicating a particular being, or claſs of beings, they are of the nature of appellatives, and mark a ſpecial character or note of diſtinction in ſuch beings. Whereas, when thus Latinized or Engliſhed, they anſwer ſolely the firſt of theſe uſes, as they come nearer the nature of proper names. This remark extends to all ſuch words, as *cherub*, *ſeraph*, *angel*, *apoſtle*, *evangeliſt*, *meſſiah*.

§ 2. Διαβολος, I obſerved, is ſometimes applied to human beings. But nothing is eaſier than to diſtinguiſh this application from the more frequent application to the arch-apoſtate. One mark of diſtinction is that, in this laſt uſe of the term, it is never found in the plural. When the plural is uſed, the context always ſhows that it is human beings, and not fallen angels, that are ſpoken of. It occurs in the plural only thrice, and only in Paul's Epiſtles. Γυναικας, ſays he*, ωσαυτως σεμνας, μη διαβολους. *Even ſo muſt their wives be grave, not ſlanderers.* In ſcriptural uſe the word may be either maſculine or feminine. Again, ſpeaking of the bad men who would appear in the laſt times, he ſays†, amongſt other things, that they will be ασοργοι, ασπονδοι, διαβολοι, in the common tranſlation, *without natural affection*, *truce-breakers*, *falſe accuſers*. Once more ‡, Πρεσβυτιδας ωσαυτως εν καταστηματι ιεροπρεπεις, μη διαβολους. *The aged women likewiſe, that they be in behaviour as becometh holineſs, not falſe accuſers.* Another criterion, whereby the application of this word to the prince of darkneſs may be diſcovered, is its being attended with the article. The term

* 1 Tim. iii. 11. † 2 Tim. iii. 3. ‡ Tit. ii. 3.

term almoſt invariably is ὁ διαβολος. I ſay *almoſt*, becauſe there a few are exceptions.

§ 3. It may not be amiſs, ere we proceed, to ſpecify the exceptions, that we may diſcover whether there be any thing in the conſtruction that ſupplies the place of the article, or at leaſt makes that it may be more eaſily diſpenſed with. Paul, addreſſing himſelf to Elymas the ſorcerer, who endeavoured to turn away the proconſul Sergius Paulus from the faith, ſays*, *O full of all ſubtilty, thou child of the devil*, υἱε διαβολε. There can be no doubt that the Apoſtle here means the evil ſpirit, agreeably to the idiom of Scripture, where a good man is called a child of God, and a bad man a child of the devil. *Ye are of your father the devil*, ſaid our Lord to the Phariſees †. As to the example from the Acts, all I can ſay is, that in an addreſs of this form, where a vocative is immediately followed by the genitive of the word conſtrued with it, the connection is conceived to be ſo cloſe as to render the omiſſion of the article more natural than in other caſes. This holds eſpecially when, as in the preſent inſtance, the addreſs muſt have been accompanied with ſome emotion and vehemence in the ſpeaker. I know not whether ὁ αντιδικος υμων διαβολος ‡, *your adverſary the devil*, ought to be conſidered as an example. There being here two appellatives, the article prefixed to the firſt, may be regared as common, though I own it is more uſual in ſuch caſes, for the greater emphaſis, to repeat it. In the word ὁς ἐστι διαβολος και σατανας §, *who is the devil and Satan*; as the ſole view is to mention the means whereby the malignant ſpirit is diſtinguiſhed, we can hardly call this inſtance an exception. Now theſe are all the examples, I can find, in which the word, though uſed indefinitely or without the article, evidently denotes our ſpiritual and ancient enemy. The examples in which it occurs in this ſenſe, with the article, it were tedious to enumerate.

§ 4. There is only one place, beſide thoſe above mentioned, where the word is found without the article, and, as it is intended to expreſs a human character, though a very bad one, ought not, I think, to have been rendered *devil*. The words are, *Jeſus anſwered, Have not I choſen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?* εξ υμων εις διαβολος εστι ‖. My reaſons for not tranſlating it *devil* in this place are; firſt, the word is ſtrictly and originally an appellative, denoting a certain bad quality, and though commonly applied to one particular being, yet naturally applicable to any kind of being ſuſceptible of moral character; ſecondly as the term in its appropriation to the arch rebel, always denotes one individual, the term *a devil* is not agreeable to Scripture ſtyle, inſomuch that I am inclined to think, that if our Lord's intention had been to uſe, by an antonomaſia, the diſtinguiſhing name of the evil ſpirit, in order to expreſs more ſtrongly the ſameneſs of character in both, he would have ſaid ὁ διαβολος, one of you is *the devil*, this being the only way whereby that evil ſpirit is diſcriminated. The words αντιδικος adverſary, πειραζων tempter with the article, are alſo uſed by way of eminence, though not ſo frequently, to expreſs the ſame malignant being; yet, when either of theſe occurs without the article, applied to a man as an adverſary or a tempter, we do not ſuppoſe any alluſion to the devil. The caſe would be different, if one were denominated ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αντιδικος, *the tempter*, *the adverſary*.

There is not any epithet (for διαβολος is no more than an epithet) by which the ſame ſpirit is oftener diſtinguiſhed, than by that of ὁ πονηρος, *the evil one*. Now, when a man is called ſimply πονηρος without the article, no more is underſtood to be implied than that he is a bad man. But if the expreſſion were ὁ πονηρος, unleſs uſed to diſtinguiſh a bad from a good man of the ſame name, we ſhould conſider it as equivalent to the devil, or *the evil one*. Even in metaphorical appellations, if a man were denominated *a dragon* or *a ſerpent*, we ſhould go no farther for the import of the metaphor, than to the nature of the animal ſo called: but if he were termed *the dragon* or *the old ſerpent*, this would immediately ſuggeſt to us, that it was the intention of the ſpeaker to repreſent the character as the ſame with that of the ſeducer of our firſt parents. The unlearned Engliſh reader will object, Where is the impropriety in ſpeaking of *a devil?* Is any thing more common in the New Teſtament? How often is there mention of perſons poſſeſſed with *a devil?* We hear too of numbers of them. Out of Mary Magdalene went ſeven; and out of the furious man who made the ſepulchres his reſidence, a legion. The Greek ſtudent needs not be informed, that in none of thoſe places is the term διαβολος, but δαιμων or δαιμονιον. Nor can any thing be clearer from Scripture than that, though the *demons* are innumerable there is but one *devil* in the univerſe. Beſides, if we muſt ſuppoſe that this word, when applied to human creatures, bears at the ſame time an alluſion to the evil ſpirit; there is the ſame reaſon for rendering it devils in the three paſſages lately quoted from Paul: for, wherever the indefinite uſe is proper in the ſingular, there can be no impropriety in the uſe of the plural. Both equally ſuppoſe that there may be many of the ſort. Now, it is plain, that thoſe paſſages would loſe greatly by ſuch an alteration. Inſtead of pointing, according to the manifeſt ſcope of the place, to a particular bad quality to be avoided, or a vice whereby

* Acts xiii. 10. † John viii. 4. ‡ 1 Pet. v. 8. § Rev. xx. 2. ‖ John vi. 70.

whereby certain dangerous perſons would be diſtinguiſhed, it could only ſerve as a vague expreſſion of what is bad in general, and ſo would convey little or no inſtruction.

§ 5. THE only plea I know in favour of the common tranſlation of the paſſage is, that, by the help of the trope *antonomaſia* (for devil in our language has much the force of a proper name), the expreſſion has more ſtrength and animation, than a mere appellative could give it. But that the expreſſion is more animated, is ſo far from being an argument in its favour, that it is, in my judgment, the contrary. It ſavours more of the human ſpirit than of the divine, more of the tranſlator than of the author. We are inclinable to put that expreſſion into an author's mouth, which we ſhould, on ſuch an occaſion, have choſen ourſelves. When affected with anger or reſentment, we always deſert the proper terms, for thoſe tropes which will convey our ſentiment with moſt aſperity. This is not the manner of our Lord, eſpecially in caſes wherein he himſelf is the direct object of either injury or inſult. Appoſite thoughts, clothed in the plaineſt expreſſions, are much more characteriſtic of his manner. When there appears ſeverity in what he ſays, it will be found to ariſe from the truth and pertinency of the thought, and not from a curious ſelection of cutting and reproachful words. This would be but ill adapted to the patience, the meekneſs, and the humility of his character; not to mention that it would be little of a piece with the account given of the reſt of his ſufferings.

I know it may objected, that the rebuke given to Peter*, *Get thee behind me, Satan*, is conceived in terms as harſh, though the provocation was far from being equal. The anſwer is much the ſame in regard to both. Satan, though conceived by us as a proper name, was an appellative in the language ſpoken by our Lord; for, from the Hebrew it paſſed into the Syriac, and ſignifyed no more than adverſary or opponent. It is naturally juſt as applicable to human, as to ſpiritual, agents, and is, in the Old Teſtament, often ſo applied.

§ 6. I ACKNOWLEDGE that the word διαβολος, in the caſe under examination, is to be underſtood as uſed in the ſame latitude with the Hebrew *Satan*, which, though commonly interpreted by the Seventy διαβολος, is ſometimes rendered επιβουλος, *inſidiator*, and may be here fitly tranſlated into Engliſh, either *ſpy* or *informer*. The Scribes and Phariſees, in conſequence of their knowledge of the oppoſition between our Lord's doctrine and theirs, had conceived an envy of him, which ſettled into malice and hatred, inſomuch that they needed no accuſer. But though Judas did not properly accuſe his maſter to them as a criminal, the purpoſe which he engaged to the Scribes, the chief prieſts, and the elders, to execute, was to obſerve his motions, and inform them when and where he might be apprehended privately without tumult, and to conduct their ſervants to the place. The term uſed was therefore pertinent, but rather ſoft than ſevere. He calls him barely *ſpy* or *informer*, whom he might have called traitor and perfidious.

§ 7. IT is now proper to enquire, ſecondly, into the uſe that has been made of the terms δαιμων and δαιμονιον. Firſt, as to the word δαιμων, it occurs only five times in the New Teſtament, once in each of the three Goſpels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and twice in the Apocalypſe. It is remarkable, that in the three Goſpels it refers to the ſame poſſeſſion, to wit, that of the furious man in the country of the Gadarenes, who haunted the ſepulchres. There does not, however, ſeem to be any material difference in this application from that of the diminutive δαιμονιον, which is alſo uſed by Luke in relation to the ſame demoniac.

§ 8. Δαιμονιον occurs frequently in the Goſpels, and always in reference to poſſeſſions real or ſuppoſed. But the word διαβολος is never ſo applied. The uſe of the term δαιμονιον is as conſtantly indefinite. Not but that it is ſometimes attended with the article: but that is only when the ordinary rules of compoſition require that the article be uſed even of a term that is ſtrictly indefinite. Thus, when a poſſeſſion is firſt named, it is called ſimply δαιμονιον *a demon*, or πνευμα ακαθαρτον, *an unclean ſpirit*, never το δαιμονι or το πνευμα ακαθαρτον. But when, in the progreſs of the ſtory, mention is again made of the ſame demon, he is ſtyled το δαιμονιον *the* demon, namely, that already ſpoken of. And in Engliſh as well as Greek, this is the uſage in regard to all indefinities. Further, the plural δαιμονια occurs frequently applied to the ſame order of beings with the ſingular. But what ſets the difference of ſignification in the cleareſt light is that, though both words, διαβολος and δαιμονιον, occur often in the Septuagint, they are invariably uſed for tranſlating different Hebrew words. Διαβολος is always in Hebrew either שטן *Satan*, *adverſary*, or צר *tſar*, *enemy*, words never tranſlated δαιμονιον. This word, on the contrary, is made to expreſs ſome Hebrew term, ſignifying idol, pagan deity, apparition, or what ſome render *ſatyr*. What the preciſe idea of the *demons*, to whom poſſeſſions were aſcribed, then was, it would perhaps be impoſſible for us with any certainty to affirm; but, as it is evident that the two words, διαβολος and δαιμονιον, are not once confounded, though the firſt occurs in the New Teſtament upwards of thirty times, and the ſecond about ſixty, they can, by no juſt rule of interpretation, be rendered by the ſame term. Poſſeſſions are never attributed to the being termed ὁ διαβολος. Nor are his authority and dominion

* Matth. xvi. 23.

minion ever ascribed to δαιμονια: nay, when the discriminating appellations of the devil are occasionally mentioned, δαιμονιον is never given as one. Thus he is called not only ὁ διαβολος, but ὁ πονηρος, ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αντιδικος, ὁ σατανας, ὁ δρακων ὁ μεγας, ὁ οφις ὁ παλαιος, ὁ αρχων του κοσμου τουτου, ὁ αρχων της εξουσιας του αερος, and ὁ θεος του αιωνος τουτου, that is, *the devil, the evil one, the tempter, the adversary* (this last word answers both to ὁ αντιδικος and ὁ σατανας, which cannot be translated differently) *the great dragon, the old serpent, the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air*, and *the god of this world*. But there is no such being as το δαιμονιον, the appellation δαιμονιον being common to multitudes, whilst the other is always represented as a singular being, the only one of his kind. Not that the Jewish notion of the devil had any resemblance to what the Persians first, and the Manicheans afterwards, called the evil principle, which they made in some sort co-ordinate with God, and the first source of all evil, as the other is of good. For *the devil*, in the Jewish system, was a creature as much as any other being in the universe, and as liable to be controlled by omnipotence, an attribute which they ascribed to God alone. But still the devil is spoken of as only one; and other beings, however bad, are never confounded with him.

§ 9. I KNOW but two passages of the history that have the appearance of exceptions from this remark. One is, that wherein our Lord, when accused of casting out demons by the prince of demons, says in return, *How can Satan cast out Satan* * ? there is no doubt that ὁ Σατανας and ὁ Διαβολος are the same. Here then, say the objectors, the former of these names is applied to δαιμονια, which seems to show an intercommunity of names. Yet it must be observed, that this of *Satan* is introduced only in the way of illustration by similitude, as the divisions in kingdoms and families also are. The utmost that can be deduced from such an example is, that they are malignant beings as well as he, engaged in the same bad cause, and perhaps of the number of those called his angels, and made to serve as his instruments. But this is no evidence that he and they are the same. The other passage is in Luke†, where we have an account of the cure of a woman, who had been bowed down for eighteen years. She is said to have had a spirit of infirmity; and our Lord himself says that Satan had bound her ‡. But let it be observed, first, that nothing is said that implies possession. She is not called δαιμονιζομενη, *a demoniac*. Our Saviour is not said to dispossess the demon, but to loose her from her infirmity: secondly, that it is a common idiom among the Jews, to put *spirit* before any quality ascribed to a person, whether it be good or bad, mental or corporeal. Thus the spirit of fear, the spirit of meekness, the spirit of slumber, the spirit of jealousy, are used to express habitual fear, &c. thirdly, that the ascribing of her disease to Satan, does not imply possession. The former is frequent, even where there is no insinuation of the latter. All the diseased whom our Lord healed, are said to have been oppressed by the devil, υπο του διαβολου§. All Job's afflictions are ascribed to Satan as the cause ||, yet Job is no where represented as a demoniac.

§ 10. A LATE learned and ingenious author¶ has written an elaborate dissertation to evince, that there was no real possession in the demoniacs mentioned in the Gospel; but that the style there employed was adopted merely in conformity to popular prejudices, and used of a natural disease. His hypothesis is by no means necessary for supporting the distinction which I have been illustrating, and which is founded purely on scriptural usage. Concerning his doctrine, I shall only say in passing that, if there had been no more to urge from sacred writ in favour of the common opinion, than the name δαιμονιζομενος, or even the phrases δαιμονιον εχειν, εκβαλλειν, &c. I should have thought his explanation at least not improbable. But when I find mention made of the number of demons in particular possessions, their actions so expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed, conversations held by the former in regard to the disposal of them after their expulsion, and accounts given how they were actually disposed of; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct which they usually observe; it is impossible for me to deny their existence, without admitting that the sacred historians were either deceived themselves in regard to them, or intended to deceive their readers. Nay, if they were faithful historians, this reflection, I am afraid, will strike still deeper. But this only by the way. To enter farther into the question here, would be foreign to my purpose. The reader of that performance, which is written very plausibly, will judge for himself.

§ 11. I OBSERVE further that, though we cannot discover, with certainty, from all that is said in the gospel concerning possession, whether the demons were conceived to be the ghosts of wicked men deceased or lapsed angels, or (as was the opinion of some early Christian writers **) the mongrel breed of certain angels (whom they understood by *the sons of God* mentioned

* Mark, iii. 23. † xiii. 11. ‡ 16. § Acts x. 38. || Job i. and ii.
¶ Dr. Farmer. ** Just. M. Apol. i.

tioned in Geneſis *), and of *the daughters of men;* it is plain they were conceived to be malignant ſpirits. They are exhibited as the cauſes of the moſt direful calamities to the unhappy perſons whom they poſſeſs, dumbneſs, deafneſs, madneſs, palſy, epilepſy, and the like. The deſcriptive titles given them, always denote ſome ill quality or other. Moſt frequently they are called πνευματα ακαθαρτα, *unclean ſpirits*, ſometimes πνευματα πονηρα, *malign ſpirits*. They are repreſented as conſcious that they are doomed to miſery and torments, though their puniſhment be for a while ſuſpended. Art thou come hither, βασανιζαι ἡμας, *to torment us before the time* †?

§ 12. BUT, though this is the character of thoſe demons who were diſlodged by our Lord out of the bodies of men and women poſſeſſed by them, it does not follow that the word *demon* always conveys this bad ſenſe, even in the New Teſtament. This having been a word much in uſe among the heathen, from whom the Helleniſt Jews firſt borrowed it, it is reaſonable to expect that, when it is uſed in ſpeaking of pagans, their cuſtoms, worſhip, and opinions; more eſpecially when pagans are repreſented as employing the term, the ſenſe ſhould be that which is conformable, or nearly ſo, to claſſical uſe. Now, in claſſical uſe, the word ſignified a divine being, though not in the higheſt order of their divinities, and therefore ſuppoſed not equivalent to θεος, but ſuperior to human, and conſequently, by the maxims of their theology, a proper object of adoration. Though they commonly uſed the term in a good ſenſe, they did not ſo always. They had evil demons as well as good. *Juxta uſurpatam*, ſays Calcidius, *penes Græcos loquendi conſuetudinem, tam ſancti ſunt dæmones quam profeſti et infidi.* But when no bad quality is aſcribed to the demon ſpoken of, and nothing affirmed that implies it, the acceptation of the term in pagan writers is generally favourable. Who has not heard of the demon of Socrates?

§ 13. IN this way the word is to be underſtood in the only paſſage of the Acts where it occurs ‡: Οι δε, Ξενων δαιμονιων δοκει καταγγελευς ειναι. *Others ſaid, he ſeemeth to be a ſetter forth of ſtrange gods.* So our tranſlators render it. The reaſon of this verdict is added, *becauſe he preached to them Jeſus and the reſurrection*, τον Ιησουν και την Αναστασιν. They ſuppoſed the former to be a male, and the latter a female divinity; for it was cuſtomary with them to deify abſtract qualities, making them either gods or goddeſſes, as ſuited the gender of the name. This, if I remember right, is the only paſſage in the New Teſtament, in which δαιμονια is not rendered devils, but *gods*. If our tranſlators had adhered to their method of rendering this word in every other inſtance, and ſaid, *He ſeemeth to be a ſetter forth of ſtrange devils*, they would have groſsly perverted the ſenſe of the paſſage. Now, this may ſuggeſt a ſuſpicion of the impropriety of this verſion of the word any where, but eſpecially where it relates to the objects of worſhip among the pagans, with whom the term, when unaccompanied with a bad epithet, or any thing in the context that fixed the application to evil ſpirits, was always employed in a good ſenſe.

§ 14. THERE is a famous paſſage to this purpoſe in the writings of the Apoſtle Paul §, on which I ſhall lay before the reader a few obſervations. Ἁ θυει τα εθνη, δαιμονιοις θυει, και ου θεω· ου θελω δε υμας κοινωνους των δαιμονιων γινεσθαι. Ου δυνασθε ποτηριον Κυριου πινειν και ποτηριον δαιμονιων· ου δυνασθε τραπεζης Κυριου μετεχειν, και τραπεζης δαιμονιων. In the Engliſh Bible thus rendered, *The things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to devils and not to God; and I would not that ye ſhould have fellowſhip with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils.* Paſſing the impropriety, ſo often obſerved above, of repreſenting a name as common to many, which Scripture has invariably appropriated to one, the ſentiment itſelf expreſſed by our tranſlators, that the Gentiles ſacrifice to devils, is not juſt, whether we conſider the thing abſtractly, or in relation to the intention of the worſhippers.

Conſidered abſtractly, the pagan worſhip and ſacrifices were not offered to God, whom they knew not, and to whoſe character and attributes there was nothing in the popular creed (I ſpeak not of philoſophers) that bore the leaſt affinity. But as little were they offered to that being, whom Chriſtians and Jews call the devil or Satan, with whoſe character and hiſtory they were equally unacquainted. Nor is it enough to ſay, that the characters of their deities were often ſo bad, that they partook more of the diabolical nature than of the divine. That is indeed true, and therefore evil ſpirits are not underſtood as excluded from the import of the term δαιμονια; but as little, on the other hand, ought that term to be confined to ſuch. The proper notion is, beings, in reſpect of power, (whatever be their other qualities) ſuperior to human, but inferior to that which we Chriſtians comprehend under the term *divine*. For this reaſon even the higher orders of the heathen divinities, thoſe whom they ſtyled *Dii majorum gentium*, are included in the Apoſtle's declaration. For, though they more rarely applied to ſuch the terms δαιμων and δαιμονιον, the power aſcribed

* vi. 2. † Matth. viii. 29. ‡ Acts xvii. 18. § 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

ſcribed to them by their votaries, was infinitely ſhort of omnipotence, as indeed all their other attributes were ſhort of the divine perfections. Paul acknowledged no God but one, of whom the Gentiles were ignorant, and to whom, therefore, they could not offer ſacrifice. All beings of a ſubordinate nature, however much they might be accounted ſuperior to us, he claſſes under the ſame general name. 'But 'can Jupiter himſelf be included in this deſcription, 'Jupiter to whom almighty power and ſupreme do-'minion are attributed, and who is ſtyled by the poets, '*The father of gods and men, the greateſt and beſt of be-'ings?*' The attributes ſometimes given to Jupiter, muſt be conſidered as words merely complimental and adulatory; they being utterly inconſiſtent with the accounts which the ſame perſons give of his origin and hiſtory. They are like the titles with which earthly potentates are ſaluted by their flatterers, when ſtyled fathers of their country, abſoute lords of earth and ocean. De la Motte's reply to Madam Dacier*, is here very appoſite: "What! Could Homer ſeriouſ-"ly believe Jupiter to be the creator of gods and "men? Could he think him the father of his own "father Saturn, whom he drove out of heaven, or "of Juno his ſiſter, and his wife; of Neptune and "Pluto his brothers, or of the nymhs, who had the "charge of him in his childhood; or of the giants "who made war upon him, and would have dethron-"ed him, if they had been then arrived at the age of "manhood? How well his actions juſtify the Latin "epithets, *optimus*, *maximus*, ſo often given him, all "the world knows." Jupiter has, therefore, no right to be held an exception, but is, with ſtrict propriety, comprehended in the name δαιμονια attributed, by the Apoſtle, to all the heathen gods. But δαιμονιον, as we have ſeen, is one thing, and ὁ διαβολος is another. Now, if a ſuppoſed reſemblance, in diſpoſition, between the heathen gods and the devil, were a ſufficient foundation for what is affirmed in the common verſion; any vicious perſon of whom mention is made in hiſtory, ſuch as Cain, Ham, Jezebel, in whom one might fancy a likeneſs in character or actions to ſome divinities of the heathen, might with equal propriety as the devil, be called the objects of their adoration.

§ 15. THERE are two paſſages in the Old Teſtament, one in the Pentateuch †, the other in the Pſalms ‡, to which, particularly the firſt, the Apoſtle had doubtleſs an alluſion. In both, the term uſed by the Septuagint is δαιμονια: the Hebrew term is not the ſame in both places, but in neither is it a word which is ever tranſlated διαβολος by the Seventy. In the Pſalm referred to, the term in the original, is that which is commonly rendered *idols*. Now, in regard to idols, the Apoſtle had ſaid in the ſame Epiſtle §, that *an idol is nothing in the world*; in other words, is the repreſentation of no real exiſtence in the univerſe, though it may be the repreſentation of an imaginary being. It is as much as to ſay, Jupiter, and Juno, and Saturn, and all the reſt of the heathen gods, as delineated by the poets and mythologiſts, are nonentities, the mere creatures of imagination. Now, if an idol repreſent no real being, it does not repreſent the devil, whoſe exiſtence is, on the Chriſtian hypotheſis, beyond a queſtion. But I am aware of the objection that, if idols repreſent no real beings, they either do not repreſent demons, or demons are not real beings. I anſwer, it is true, that no individual demons, actually exiſting, are properly repreſented by their idols; nevertheleſs, theſe may, with ſtrict juſtice, be ſaid to repreſent the genus or kind, that is, beings intermediate between God and man, leſs than the former, greater than the latter. For to all who come under this deſcription, real or imaginary, good or bad, the name *demons* is promiſcuouſly given. The reality of ſuch intermediate orders of beings, revelation every where ſuppoſes, and rational theiſm does not contradict. Now, it is to *the kind* expreſſed in the definition now given, that the pagan deities are repreſented as correſponding, and not individually to *particular demons* actually exiſting. To ſay, therefore, that the Gentiles ſacrifice to *demons*, is no more than to ſay, that they ſacrifice to beings which, whether real or imaginary, we perceive, from their own accounts of them, to be below the ſupreme. "What are men?" ſays a dialogiſt in Lucian ‖. The anſwer is, "Mortal gods. What are gods? Immortal men." In fact, immortality was almoſt the only diſtinction between them.

§ 16. THIS leads directly to the examination of the juſtneſs of the ſentiment, that *the Gentiles ſacrifice to devils*, in the ſecond view of it that was ſuggeſted, or conſidered in relation to the ideas and intentions of the worſhippers themſelves, to which alone, in my apprehenſion, the Apoſtle here alludes. Firſt then, we may juſtly ſay, that their ſacrifices were not offered to God; for, however much they might uſe the name of God, the intention is to be judged, not by the name, but by the meaning affixed to it. Now, ſuch a being as the eternal, unoriginated, immutable, Creator and Ruler of the world, they had not in all their ſyſtem, and therefore did not adore. For this reaſon, they are not unjuſtly termed, by the ſame

* De la Critique; ſeconde partie. Des Dieux. † Deut. xxxii. 17. ‡ Pſal. xcvi. 5. § 1 Cor. viii. 4.
‖ Vitarum auctio. Τι δαι οι ανθρωποι; θεοι θνητοι. τι δαι οι θεοι; ανθρωποι αθανατοι.

Apoſtle, αθεοι, *atheiſts* *, without God, that is, without the knowledge, and, conſequently, the belief and worſhip, of him who alone is God. But their ſacrifices and devotions were preſented to beings, to whom they themſelves aſcribed a character infinitely inferior to what we know to belong to the true God, of whom they were ignorant.

A late philoſopher, who will not be ſuſpected of partiality to the ſentiments of an Apoſtle, or of the weakneſs of a bias in favour of Chriſtianity, has, nevertheleſs, in this inſtance, adopted the ideas of the ſacred author, and has not heſitated to pronounce the pagans † *a kind of ſuperſtitious atheiſts, who acknowledged no being that correſponds to our idea of a deity.* Beſides, a great part of the heathen worſhip was confeſſedly paid to the ghoſts of departed heroes, of conquerors, and potentates, and of the inventors of arts, whom popular ſuperſtition, after diſguiſing their hiſtory with fables and abſurdities, had blindly deified. Now, to all ſuch beings, they themſelves, as well as the Jews, aſſigned the name δαιμονια. Further, it deſerves our notice, that the Apoſtle is not writing here to Hebrews, but to Greeks; and that he himſelf, being a native of a Grecian city, knew perfectly the ſenſe that was affixed by them to the word δαιμονια. If, therefore, he had intended to ſuggeſt, that they were all malignant beings to whom their devotions were addreſſed, he would never have uſed the general term, which he knew they commonly underſtood in a more favorable ſenſe. In that caſe, he would have ſaid κακοδαιμοσι θυει, or ſomething equivalent.

§ 17. HOWEVER much, therefore, the Gentiles might have diſputed the truth of the firſt part of the Apoſtle's aſſertion, that they did not offer ſacrifice to God, becauſe they were not ſenſible of their own ignorance on this article, the latter part of the aſſertion they would have readily admitted, that they ſacrificed to demons, ſuch as the ſpirits of heroes and heroines deceaſed, and other beings conceived ſuperior to mere mortals. This charge they themſelves would not have pretended to be either injurious or untrue. The very paſſage formerly quoted from the Acts, where they call Jeſus and the reſurrection *ſtrange demons*, ξενα δαιμονια, ſhews, that there were *known demons*, γνωριμα δαιμονια, to whoſe ſervice they were accuſtomed. We cannot worſhip whom we do not mean to worſhip. There is an inconſiſtency in the ideas. They could, therefore, no more be ſaid to have worſhipped the devil, as we Chriſtians underſtand the term, than they could be ſaid to have worſhipped the cannibals of New Zealand, becauſe they had no more conception of the one than of the other. However much it may be in the ſpirit of theological controvertiſts, to uſe amplifications irreconcilable with truth and juſtice, in order to render an adverſary odious; this manner is not in the ſpirit of the ſacred penmen. Some appearances of the polemic temper there are in moſt verſions of the New Teſtament, which will be found to ſpring entirely from tranſlators. The popular doctrine has indeed been adopted by Milton, and greatly embelliſhed in his incomparable poem. But it is not from the fictions of poets that we muſt draw the principles of religion.

§ 18. I MUST likewiſe own that when, in the paſſage to the Corinthians under examination, we render δαιμονια *demons*, we ſtill expreſs the ſentiment more harſhly than it is in the original, becauſe the word was often then uſed in a good ſenſe, or at leaſt, not as we Chriſtians uſe it at preſent, invariably in a bad ſenſe. One way, however, of reſtoring it to its proper import, is to preſerve ſacredly the diſtinction, which holy writ ſo plainly authoriſes, and never to confound terms as ſynonymous, which are there never confounded.

§ 19. THE above obſervations may ſerve alſo to illuſtrate a noted paſſage in the Apocalypſe ‡: *The reſt of the men which were not killed by theſe plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they ſhould not worſhip devils*, δαιμονια, *and idols of gold and ſilver, and braſs, and ſtone, and of wood, which neither can ſee, nor hear, nor walk.* It is equally manifeſt here, as in the former example, that the word rendered *devils*, ought to have been *demons*; nor is it leſs manifeſt, that every being who is not the one true God, however much conceived to be ſuperior to us, is, whether good or bad, hero or heroine, demigod or demigoddeſs, angel or departed ſpirit, ſaint or ſinner, real or imaginary, in the claſs comprized under the name *demons*. And the worſhip of them is as much *demonolatry* (if ye will admit the word) as the worſhip of Jupiter, Mars, and Minerva. This may ſerve to ſhew, of how much conſequence it is to attend, with accuracy, to the differences to be found in the application of words. It is only thereby that we can learn their exact import, and be qualified to judge both of the ſubject, and of the completion of ſcriptural prophecies. As to the worſhip of the devil του διαβολου, nothing can be clearer than that, in Scripture, no pagans are charged with it; and as to the worſhip των δαιμονιων, beings ſubordinate to the ſupreme, it may be conſidered how far we can with juſtice ſay, that the pagans are peculiarly chargeable. It will deſerve to be remarked, by the way, that the only difference between demonolatry and idolatry appears to be, that the firſt regards the object of worſhip, the ſecond the mode. The former is a violation of the firſt commandment, the latter of the ſecond. The connection,

* Eph. ii. 12. † Natural Hiſtory of Religion, Sect. IV. ‡ Rev. ix. 20.

connection, however, is ſo intimate between them, that they have rarely, if ever, been found ſeparate.

§ 20. THERE are only two other paſſages wherein the word δαιμονια occurs in the New Teſtament, in both which there is ſome difficulty. One is, where Paul warns Timothy † of thoſe who would make a defection from the faith, *giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and doctrines of devils*, διδασκαλιαις δαιμονιων, doctrines of demons. It is hard to ſay whether, by this phraſe, we are to underſtand doctrines ſuggeſted by demons, or doctrines concerning demons. The form of expreſſion will ſupport either meaning. If the firſt, the word *demons* is taken in a bad ſenſe, for ghoſts, or other ſpirits of a malignant character, the common acceptation of the word in the Goſpels, where an agency on human beings is aſcribed to them. The connection of the words, *doctrines of demons*, with *ſeducing ſpirits*, immediately preceding, gives ſome plauſibility to this interpretation. If the ſecond, there is reaſon to think, that it is uſed more extenſively, for all thoſe beings, inferior to God, who are made objects of adoration. In this caſe, the words foretel either a total apoſtacy from the faith of the Goſpel, to heathen demonology, commonly called mythology, or a defection from the purity of its doctrine, by admitting an unnatural mixture of heatheniſh abſurdities. That this is his meaning, is rendered not improbable, by its being connected with other corruptions of the Chriſtian doctrine, alſo introduced ſome ages after the times of the Apoſtles, and implied in the words, *forbidding to marry, and abſtaining from meats, &c.* But in regard to this queſtion, I do not pretend to decide.

§ 21. THE other paſſage is in the Epiſtle of James ‡. The whole verſe in the common verſion runs thus: *Thou believeſt that there is one God; thou doſt well: the devils alſo believe and tremble*: τα δαιμονια, the demons. That the Apoſtle here means the ſpirits of wicked men deceaſed, which (in Jewiſh uſe, as we learn from Joſephus) were commonly ſtyled demons, there is no reaſon to queſtion. The only points of which their belief is aſſerted, are the being and the unity of the Godhead. The epithet δαιμονιωδης is accordingly uſed in a bad ſenſe in this Epiſtle §, where that wiſdom which produceth envy and contention, is ſtyled earthly, ſenſual, *deviliſh*, δαιμονιωδης, demonian.

§ 22. THE only other words in the New Teſtament, connected with δαιμων, are δεισιδαιμων and δεισιδαιμονια. Each occurs only once. The former is rendered, by our tranſlators, *ſuperſtitious*, the latter *ſuperſtition*. Neither of them is found in the Septuagint, or the Apocrypha, or in any part of the New Teſtament, except the Acts of the Apoſtles. We may readily believe, that the Jews, in ſpeaking of their own religion, would avoid the uſe of terms bearing ſo manifeſt an alluſion to a ſpecies of worſhip which it condemns. The only place where the term δεισιδαιμων occurs, is Paul's ſpeech in the Arcopagus at Athens. It is applied by him to the Athenians, who were pagans. Ανδρες Αθηναιοι, ſays he, κατα παντα ως δεισιδαιμονεστερους υμας θεωρω ‖; in the common verſion, *Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too ſuperſtitious*. The Engliſh expreſſion is, in my opinion, much harſher than the Greek. As the word no where elſe occurs in the ſacred writings, our only rule for aſcertaining its import is the claſſical application. Beſides, the Apoſtle, being a native of a Grecian city, well knew in what ſenſe his hearers would underſtand the term. If then he ſpoke to be underſtood, we muſt ſuppoſe that he employed his words according to their current value in the place. Now, it is plain that, in the claſſical uſe, δεισιδαιμων has not a bad meaning, unleſs there be ſomething in the context that leads us to an unfavourable interpretation. Αιει δε δεισιδαιμων ην; *He was always a religious man*, ſays Xenophon of Ageſilaus, when he is plainly commending him. Favorinus explains the word by ευσεβης, *pious*; and gives ευσεβεια as the common import of δεισιδαιμονια, which he reſolves into φοβος θεων η δαιμονων, *the fear of God, or of demons*.

Now, it has been ſhown, that among pagans, in the common acceptation of δαιμων, the meaning was favourable. It is acknowledged that δεισιδαιμων was alſo ſuſceptible of a bad meaning, anſwering to our word *ſuperſtitious*. Further, I readily admit that the Apoſtle would not probably have uſed that term in ſpeaking of either Jews or Chriſtians, becauſe he did not conſider the δαιμονες as objects of their veneration. At the ſame time, he knew, that in addreſſing the Athenians, he employed a term which could not be offenſive to them. Indeed, his manner of introducing his ſubject, ſhews a deſire of ſoftening the diſapprobation which his words imply, and from which he took occaſion to expound the principles of a more ſublime theology. The Athenians gloried in the character of being more religious, δεισιδαιμονεστεροι, than any other Grecian ſtate, Paul's conceſſion of this point in their favour, would rather gratify than offend them, and would ſerve to alleviate the cenſure of carrying their religion to exceſs. Every thing, in the turn of his expreſſion, ſhews that it was his intention to tell them, in the mildeſt terms, what he found cenſurable in their devotion, and thence to take occaſion of preaching to them the only true God. Accordingly, he employed a word, which he knew no pagan could take amiſs; and to denote the exceſs with which he thought them chargeable, he choſe to uſe the comparative degree,

† 1 Tim. iv. 1. ‡ James ii. 12. § iii. 15. ‖ Acts, xvii. 22.

which was the gentleſt manner of doing it. Nay, he even abates the import of the comparative, by the particle ως. Beza has properly rendered the expreſſion, *quaſi religioſiores*. The verſion, *too ſuperſtitious*, not only deviates from the intention of the ſpeaker, but includes a groſs impropriety, as it implies that it is right to be ſuperſtitious to a certain degree, and that the error lies in exceeding that degree; whereas, in the univerſal acceptation of the Engliſh term, all ſuperſtitution is exceſs, and therefore faulty.

As to the noun δεισιδαιμονια, in the only place of Scripture where it occurs, it is mentioned as uſed by a heathen, in relation to the Jewiſh religion. Feſtus, the preſident, when he acquainted king Agrippa concerning Paul, at that time his priſoner, ſays that he found the accuſation brought againſt him by his countrymen, not to be ſuch as he had expected, but to conſiſt in ζητηματα τινα περι της ιδιας δεισιδαιμονιας, in the Engliſh tranſlation, *certain queſtions of their own ſuperſtition* *. That the Gentiles were accuſtomed to ſpeak of it contemptuouſly, is notorious. But it ſhould be conſidered, that Feſtus was then addreſſing his diſcourſe to king Agrippa, whom he knew to be a Jew, who had come to Ceſarea to congratulate him, and to whom it appears, from the whole of the ſtory, that Feſtus meant to ſhow the utmoſt civility. It cannot then be imagined, that he would intentionally affront a viſitant of his rank, the very purpoſe of whoſe viſit had been to do him honour on his promotion. That the ordinary import of the term was favourable, cannot be queſtioned. Diodorus Siculus, ſpeaking of the religious ſervice performed by the high prieſt, at which the kings of Egypt were obliged to be preſent, adds, Ταυτα δ' επραττεν, αμα μεν εις δεισιδαιμονιαν και θεοφιλη βιον τον βασιλεα προτρεπομενος †. "Theſe things he did to excite the king to a devout and pious life." The word, therefore, ought to have been rendered *religion*, according to its primitive and moſt uſual acceptation among the Greeks.

Biſhop Pierce is, for aught I know, ſingular in thinking that της ιδιας δεισιδαιμονιας ought to be tranſlated *of a private ſuperſtition*, meaning the Chriſtian doctrine taught by Paul. But of this verſion the words are evidently not ſuſceptible; the only authority alleged is Peter, who ſays ‡, πασα προφητεια γραφης ιδιας επιλυσεως ου γινεται, in the common tranſlation, *No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation*. Admitting that this is a juſt expreſſion of the ſenſe of that paſſage, the caſes are not parallel. ιδιος has there no article. If the import of ιδιος in the other place were *private*, the meaning of the phraſe muſt not be *a* but *the* private ſuperſtition, or the private religion. Had we any evidence that this deſignation had been given to Chriſtianity in the times of the Apoſtles, there might be ſome plauſibility in the conjecture. But there is no trace of ſuch a deſignation; and indeed it would have been exceedingly improper as applied to a doctrine, which was preached publicly every where, and of whoſe miniſters, both Jews and Pagans complained that they turned the world upſide down. There are few words in the New Teſtament more common than ιδιος, but there is not a ſingle inſtance wherein it is accompanied with the article, that can be rendered otherwiſe than *his own*, *her own*, or *their own*.

§ 23. So much for the diſtinction uniformly obſerved in Scripture between the words διαβολος and δαιμονιον; to which I ſhall only add, that in the ancient Syriac verſion, theſe names are always duly diſtinguiſhed. The words employed in tranſlating one of them are never uſed in rendering the other; and in all the Latin tranſlations I have ſeen, ancient and modern, Popiſh and Proteſtant, this diſtinction is carefully obſerved. It is obſerved alſo in Diodati's Italian verſion, and moſt of the late French verſions. But in Luther's German tranſlation, the Geneva French, and the common Engliſh, the words are confounded in the manner above obſerved. Some of the later Engliſh tranſlations have corrected this error, and ſome have implicitly followed the common verſion.

PART II.

Ἁιδης and γεεννα.

THE next example I ſhall produce of words in which, though commonly tranſlated by the ſame Engliſh term, there is a real difference of ſignification, ſhall be ἁιδης and γεεννα, in the common verſion rendered *hell*. That γεεννα is employed in the New Teſtament to denote the place of future puniſhment, prepared for the

* Acts xxv. 16. ‡ Lib. i. † 2 Peter i. 20.

the devil and his angels, is indiſputable. In the Old Teſtament we do not find this place in the ſame manner mentioned. Accordingly the word γεεννα does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and conſequently not to be found in the Grecian claſſics. It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words גיא הנם *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jeruſalem, of which we hear firſt in the Book of Joſhua *. It was there that the cruel ſacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitiſh idol †. The place was alſo called *Tophet* ‡, and that, as is ſuppoſed, from the noiſe of drums (Toph ſignifying a drum), a noiſe raiſed on purpoſe to drown the cries of the helpleſs infants. As this place was, in proceſs of time, conſidered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reſerved for the puniſhment of the wicked in a future ſtate, the name *Tophet* came gradually to be uſed in this ſenſe, and at length to be confined to it. This is the ſenſe, if I miſtake not, in which *gehenna*, a ſynonymous term, is always to be underſtood in the New Teſtament, where it occurs juſt twelve times. In ten of theſe there can be no doubt: in the other two the expreſſion is figurative; but it ſcarcely will admit a queſtion, that the figure is taken from that ſtate of miſery which awaits the impenitent. Thus the Phariſees are ſaid to make the proſelyte, whom they compaſs ſea and land to gain, twofold more a child of hell, υιος γεεννης, than themſelves §; an expreſſion both ſimilar in form, and equivalent in ſignification, to υιος διαβολου, *ſon of the devil*, and υιος της απωλειας, *ſon of perdition*. In the other paſſage an unruly tongue is ſaid to be *ſet on fire of hell* ‖, φλογιζομενη υπο της γεεννης. Theſe two cannot be conſidered as exceptions, it being the manifeſt intention of the writers in both to draw an illuſtration of the ſubject from that ſtate of perfect wretchedneſs.

§ 2. As to the word ἁδης, which occurs in eleven places of the New Teſtament, and is rendered *hell* in all, except one, where it is tranſlated *grave*, it is quite common in claſſical authors, and frequently uſed by the Seventy in the tranſlation of the Old Teſtament. In my judgment it ought never in Scripture to be rendered *hell*, at leaſt in the ſenſe wherein that word is now univerſally underſtood by Chriſtians. In the Old Teſtament the correſponding word is שאול *ſheol*, which ſignifies the ſtate of the dead in general, without regard to the goodneſs or badneſs of the perſons, their happineſs or miſery. In tranſlating that word, the Seventy have almoſt invariably uſed ἁδης. This word is alſo uſed ſometimes in rendering the nearly ſynonymous words or phraſes בור *bor*, שבגי בור *abne bor*. *the pit*, and *ſtones of the pit*, צל מות *ſal moth*, *the ſhades of death*, דומה *dumeh*, *ſilence*. The ſtate is always repreſented under thoſe figures which ſuggeſt ſomething dreadful, dark, and ſilent, about which the moſt prying eye, and liſtening ear, can acquire no information. The term ἁδης, *hades*, is well adapted to expreſs this idea. It was written anciently, as we learn from the poets (for what is called the poetic, is nothing but the ancient dialect), αιδης, *ab a privativo et ιδω video*, and ſignifies obſcure, hidden, inviſible. To this the word *hell* in its primitive ſignification perfectly correſponded. For, at firſt, it denoted only what was ſecret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and preciſely in the ſame meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects ¶.

But though our word *hell*, in its original ſignification, was more adapted to expreſs the ſenſe of ἁδης than of γεεννα, it is not ſo now. When we ſpeak as Chriſtians, we always expreſs by it, the place of the puniſhment of the wicked after the general judgment, as oppoſed to heaven, the place of the reward of the righteous. It is true, that in tranſlating heathen poets, we retain the old ſenſe of the word *hell*, which anſwers to the Latin *orcus*, or rather *infernus*, as when we ſpeak of the deſcent of Æneas, or of Orpheus, into *hell*. Now the word *infernus*, in Latin, comprehends the receptacle of all the dead, and contains both *elyſium* the place of the bleſſed, and *tartarus* the abode of the miſerable. The term *inferi*, comprehends all the inhabitants good and bad, happy and wretched. The Latin word *infernus* and *inferi* bear evident traces of the notion that the repoſitory of the ſouls of the departed is under ground. This appears alſo to have been the opinion of both Greeks and Hebrews, and indeed of all antiquity. How far the ancient practice of burying the body may have contributed to produce this idea concerning the manſion of the ghoſts of the deceaſed, I ſhall not take upon me to ſay; but it is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint verſion of the Old Teſtament, nor in the New, does the word ἁδης convey the meaning which the preſent Engliſh word *hell*, in the Chriſtian uſage, always conveys to our minds.

§ 3. It were endleſs to illuſtrate this remark by an enumeration and examination of all the paſſages in both Teſtaments wherein the word is found. The attempt would be unneceſſary, as it is hardly now pretended by any critic, that this is the acceptation of the term in the Old Teſtament. Who for example, would render the words of the venerable patriarch Jacob **, when he was deceived by his ſons into the opinion that his favourite child Joſeph had been devoured by a wild beaſt, *I will go down to hell to my ſon mourning?* or the words which he uſed ††, when they expoſtulated with him, about ſending his youngeſt

* Joſ. xv. 8. † 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. ‡ 2 Kings xxiii. 10. § Matt. xxiii. 15. ‖ James iii. 6.
¶ See Junius' Gothic Gloſſary, ſubjoined to the Codex Argenteus, on the word *hulyan*. ** Gen. xxxviii. 35. †† xlii. 30.

youngeſt ſon Benjamin into Egypt, along with them; *Ye will bring down my grey hairs with ſorrow to hell?* Yet in both places the word, in the original, is *ſheol*, and in the verſion of the Seventy, *hades*. I ſhall only add, that in the famous paſſage from the Pſalms *, quoted in the Acts of the Apoſtles † of which I ſhall have occaſion to take notice afterwards; though the word is the ſame both in Hebrew and in Greek, as in the two former quotations, and though it is in both places rendered *hell* in the common verſion, it would be abſurd to underſtand it as denoting the place of the damned, whether the expreſſion be interpreted literally of David the type, or of Jeſus Chriſt the antitype, agreeably to its principal and ultimate object.

§ 4. But it appears at preſent to be the prevailing opinion among critics, that the term, at leaſt in the Old Teſtament, means no more than קבר *keber*, *grave* or *ſepulchre*. Of the truth of this opinion, after the moſt attentive and, I think, impartial examination, I am far from being convinced. At the ſame time I am not inſenſible of the weight which is given to that interpretation by ſome great names in the learned world, particularly that of Father Simon, a man deeply verſed in oriental literature, who has expreſsly ſaid ‡, that *ſheol* ſignifies, in the Hebrew of the Old Teſtament, *ſepulchre*, and who has ſtrenuouſly and repeatedly defended this ſentiment againſt Le Clerc and others who had attacked it §. And ſince he ſeems even to challenge his opponents to produce examples from the Old Teſtament, wherein the word *ſheol* has the ſignification which they aſcribe to it; I ſhall here briefly, with all the deference due to names ſo reſpectable as thoſe which appear on the oppoſite ſide, lay before the reader the reſult of my enquires upon the queſtion.

§ 5. I freely acknowledge that, by tranſlating *ſheol the grave*, the purport of the ſentence is often expreſſed with ſufficient clearneſs. The example laſt quoted from Geneſis is an evidence. *Ye will bring down my grey hairs with ſorrow to the grave*, undoubtedly gives the meaning of the ſentence in the original, notwithſtanding that the Engliſh word *grave* does not give the meaning of the Hebrew word *ſheol*. This may at firſt appear a paradox, but will not be found ſo, when examined. Suppoſe, one in relating the circumſtances of a friend's death, ſhould ſay, "This unlucky accident brought "him to his ſhroud," another ſhould ſay, "It "brought him to his coffin," a third, "It brought "him to his grave." The ſame ſentiment is expreſſed by them all, and theſe plain words, "This accident "proved the cauſe of his death," are equivalent to what was ſaid by every one of them. But is it juſt to infer thence that the Engliſh words *ſhroud*, *coffin*, *grave*, and *death*, are ſynonymous terms? It will not be pretended. Yet I have not heard any argument ſtronger than this, for accounting the Hebrew words *ſheol* and *keber* ſynonymmous. The caſes are entirely parallel. Uſed as tropes, they often no doubt are ſo. Who can queſtion that when there is any thing figurative in the expreſſion, the ſenſe may be conveyed without the figure, or by another figure? And if ſo, the figures or tropes, however different, may doubtleſs, in ſuch application, be called ſynonymous to one another, and to the proper term.

Now, if this holds of the tropes of the ſame language, it holds alſo of thoſe of different languages. You may adopt a trope in tranſlating, which does not literally anſwer to that of the original, and which, nevertheleſs, conveys the ſenſe of the original more juſtly than the literal verſion would have done. But in this caſe, though the whole ſentence in the verſion correſponds to the whole ſentence in the original, there is not the like correſpondence in the words taken ſeverally. Sometimes the reverſe happens, to wit, that every word of a ſentence in the original, has a word exactly correſponding in the verſion; and yet the whole ſentence in the one does not correſpond to the whole ſentence in the other. The different geniuſes of different languages, render it impoſſible to obtain always a correſpondence in both reſpects. When it can be had only in one, the ſentiment is always to be preferred to the words. For this reaſon I do not know how our tranſlators could have rendered *ſheol* in that paſſage better than they have done. Taken by itſelf, we have no word in our language that anſwers to it. The Latin is, in this inſtance, luckier; as it ſupplies a word perfectly equivalent to that of the ſacred penman, at the ſame time that it juſtly expreſſes the ſenſe of whole. Such is the tranſlation of the verſe in the Vulgate, *Deducetis canos meos cum dolore ad inferos*. Now, though our word *the grave*, may anſwer ſufficiently in ſome caſes for expreſſing, not the import of the Hebrew word *ſheol*, but the purport of the ſentence, it gives, in other caſes, but a feeble, and ſometimes an improper, verſion of the original. But this will be more evident afterwards.

§ 6. First, in regard to the ſituation of *hades*, it ſeems always to have been conceived by both Jews and pagans, as in the lower parts of the earth, near its centre, as we ſhould term it, or its foundations (according to the notions of the Hebrews, who knew nothing

* Pſal. xvi. 10. † Acts ii. 27. ‡ Hiſt. Crit. du N. T. ch. 12.
§ Reponſe a la Defenſe des Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, ch. xvi.

nothing of its ſpherical figure), and anſwering in depth to the viſible heavens in height; both which are, on this account, oftener than once, contraſted in ſacred writ. In general, to expreſs any thing inconceivably deep, this word is adopted, which ſhows ſufficiently that unfathomable depth was always a concommitant of the idea conveyed by *ſheol*. Thus God is repreſented by Moſes as ſaying*, *A fire is kindled in mine anger, and ſhall burn to the loweſt hell*, as it is rendered in the common verſion. The word is *ſheol* or *hades*; and Simon himſelf admits †, that it is here an hyberbole, which ſignifies that the fire ſhould reach the bottom of the earth, and conſume the whole earth. I acknowledge that it is in this paſſage uſed hyperbolically. But will any perſon pretend that it could have anſwered the purpoſe of giving the moſt terrible view of divine judgments, if the literal meaning of the word had implied no more than a grave? This conceſſion of Simon's, is in effect giving up the cauſe. According to the explanation I have given of the proper ſenſe of the word, it was perfectly adapted to ſuch an uſe, and made a ſtriking hyperbole; but if his account of the literal and ordinary import of the term be juſt; the expreſſion, ſo far from being hyperbolical, would have been the reverſe.

In further evidence of this doctrine, the inhabitants of ἀδης are, from their ſubterranean abode, denominated in the New Teſtament ‡ καταχθονιοι, a word of the ſame import with the phraſe υποκατω της γης, *under the earth*, in the Apocalypſe §, and which, with the επουρανιοι and επιγειοι, *celeſtial* and *terreſtrial* beings, include the whole rational creation. Of the coincidence of the Hebrew and the pagan notions in regard to the ſituation of the place of departed ſpirits, if it were neceſſary to add any thing to what was obſerved above, from the import of the names *infernus* and *inferi*, theſe beautiful lines of Virgil might ſuffice:

> Non ſecus, ac ſi quâ penitus vi terra dehiſcens
> Infernas reſeret ſedes, et regna recludat
> Pallida, diis inviſa, ſuperque immane barathrum
> Cernatur, trepidentque immiſſo lumine manes‖.

§ 7. SEVERAL proofs might be brought from the prophets, and even from the Goſpels, of the oppoſition in which heaven for height, and hades for depth, were conceived to ſtand to each other. I ſhall produce but a few from the Old Teſtament, which convey the moſt preciſe notion of their ſentiments on this ſubject. The firſt is from the Book of Job ¶, where we have an illuſtration of the unſearchableneſs of the divine perfections in theſe memorable words, as found inthe common verſion, *Canſt thou by ſearching find out God? canſt thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?* It is as *high as heaven, what canſt thou do? Deeper than hell,* βαθυτερα δε των εν ἀδου; *what canſt thou know? The meaſure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the ſea.* Now of the opinion that the word in the Old Teſtament always denotes *grave* or *ſepulchre*, nothing can be a fuller confutation than this paſſage. Among ſuch immenſe diſtances as the height of heaven, the extent of the earth, and the ocean, which were not only in thoſe days unknown to men, but conceived to be unknowable; to introduce as one of the unmeaſureables, a ſepulchre whoſe depth could ſcarcely exceed ten or twelve cubits, and which, being the work of men, was perfectly known, would have been abſurd indeed, not to ſay ridiculous. What man in his ſenſes could have ſaid, "Ye can no more comprehend the Deity, than ye can "diſcover the height of the firmament, or meaſure the "depth of a grave."

A paſſage very ſimilar we have in the Pſalms **, where heaven and ἀδης are in the ſame way contraſted. *If I aſcend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell,* εαν καταβω εις τον ἀδην, *behold thou art there.* The only other place I ſhall mention is in the Prophet Amos ††, where God is repreſented as ſaying, *Though they dig into hell,* εις ἀδου, *thence ſhall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down, and though they hide themſelves on the top of Carmel, I will ſearch and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my ſight in the bottom of the ſea, thence will I command the ſerpent, and he ſhall bite them.* Here for illuſtration we have a double contraſt. To the top of Carmel, a very high mountain, is contraſted very properly the bottom of the ſea; but to heaven, which is incomparably higher than the higheſt mountain, no ſuitable contraſt is found, except *ſheol* or *hades*, which was evidently conceived to be the loweſt thing in the world. The επιγειοι were ſuppoſed to poſſeſs the middle parts, the επουρανιοι and καταχθονιοι occupied the extremes, the former in height, the latter in depth. A late writer, of profound erudition, of whoſe ſentiments on this ſubject I ſhall have occaſion ſoon to take notice, has quoted the above paſſage of Amos, to prove that *into ſheol men penetrate by digging*: he might, with equal reaſon, have quoted it to prove that *into heaven men penetrate by climbing*, or that men, in order to hide themſelves, have recourſe to the bottom of the ſea.

§ 8. AGAIN, let it be obſerved, that *keber*, the Hebrew word for *grave* or *ſepulchre*, is never rendered in the ancient tranſlation ἀδης, but ταφος, μνημα, or ſome equivalent term. *Sheol*, on the contrary, is never rendered ταφος or μνημα, but always ἀδης; nor is ever conſtrued with θαπτω, or any verb which ſignifies to bury, a thing almoſt inevitable in words ſo frequently occurring,

* Deut. xxxii. 22. † Reponſe a la Defenſe, &c. ch. xvi. ‡ Phil. ii. 10. § v. 13.
‖ Æn. viii. ¶ Job xi, 7, 8, 9. ** Pſal. cxxxix. 8. †† Amos ix. 2, 3.

ring, if it had ever properly ſignified a grave. This itſelf might ſuffice to ſhow that the ideas which the Jews had of theſe were never confounded. I obſerve further, that ἅιδης, as well as the correſponding Hebrew word, is always ſingular in meaning, as well as in form. The word for grave is often plural. The former never admits the poſſeſſive pronouns, being the receptacle of all the dead, and therefore incapable of an appropriation to individuals, the latter often. Where the diſpoſal of the body or corpſe is ſpoken of, τάφος, or ſome equivalent term, is the name of its repoſitory. When mention is made of the ſpirit after death, its abode is ἅιδης. When notice is taken of one's making or viſiting the grave of any perſon, touching it, mourning at it, or erecting a pillar or monument upon it, and the like, it is always *keber* that is employed. Add to all this that, in *hades*, all the dead are repreſented as preſent, without exception. The caſe is quite different with the graves or ſepulchres. Thus, Iſaiah repreſents, very beautifully and poetically, a great and ſudden deſolation that would be brought upon the earth, ſaying *, *Hades*, which is in the common verſion, *Hell hath enlarged herſelf, and opened her mouth without meaſure. Hades* alone is conceived to contain them all, though the graves, in which their bodies were depoſited, might be innumerable. Again, in the ſong of triumph on the fall of the king of Babylon †, *Hell* (the original word is the ſame as is in the preceding paſſage) *from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it ſtirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth: it hath raiſed up from their thrones all the kings of the nations.* Thus, in *hades*, all the monarchs and nobles, not of one family or race, but of the whole earth, are aſſembled. Yet their ſepulchres are as diſtant from one another as the nations they governed. Thoſe mighty dead are raiſed, not from their couches, which would have been the natural expreſſion, had the Prophet's idea been a ſepulchral vault, how magnificent ſoever, but *from their thrones*, as ſuited the notion of all antiquity, concerning not the bodies, but the ſhades or ghoſts of the departed, to which was always aſſigned ſomething ſimilar in rank and occupation to what they had poſſeſſed upon the earth. Nay, as is well obſerved by Caſtalio ‡, thoſe are repreſented as in hades, whoſe carcaſes were denied the honours of ſepulture.

§ 9. To the preceding examples, I ſhall add but one other from the Old Teſtament. It is taken from that beautiful paſſage in Job §, wherein God himſelf is the ſpeaker, and whereof the great purpoſe is, to expoſe human ignorance, and check human preſumption. *Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or haſt thou ſeen the doors of the ſhadow of death?* For this laſt deſignation the term is in Hebrew *tſalmoth*, and in the tranſlation of the Seventy, ἅιδης: for, as was hinted before *tſalmoth*, in its ordinary acceptation, is ſynonymous with *ſheol*, though ſometimes uſed metaphorically, for a very dark place, or a ſtate of great ignorance. It is almoſt too obvious to need being remarked, that this challenge to Job could have no relation to a ſepulchre, the door, or entry to which, is always known to the living. The caſe was very different with regard to the habitation of departed ſpirits. At the ſame time, I entirely agree with the learned and ingenious biſhop Lowth ‖, that the cuſtom of depoſiting under ground the bodies of the deceaſed, and the form of their ſepulchres, have, probably, firſt ſuggeſted ſome of the gloomy notions entertained on this ſubject. But popular opinions have a growth and progreſs, and come often, eſpecially in queſtions at once ſo intereſting and ſo inſcrutable, to differ widely from what they were originally. May we not then, upon the whole, fairly conclude, that we have all the evidence which the nature of the thing will admit, and more than in moſt philological inquiries is thought ſufficient, that the word *grave* or *ſepulchre* never conveys the full import of the Hebrew *ſheol*, or the Greek *hades*, though, in ſome inſtances, it may have all the preciſion neceſſary for giving the import of the ſentiment?

§ 10. EVEN in ſome inſtances, where the language is ſo figurative, as to allow great latitude to a tranſlator, the original term is but weakly rendered *grave*. Thus it is ſaid ¶, *Love is ſtrong as death, jealouſy is cruel as the grave.* The *grave*, when perſonified, or uſed metaphorically, is more commonly, if I miſtake not, exhibited as a gentle power, which brings relief from cruelty, oppreſſion, and trouble of every kind; whereas *hades*, which regards more the ſtate of departed ſouls, than the manſions of their bodies, exhibits, when perſonified, a ſevere and inflexible jailor, who is not to be gained by the moſt pathetic entreaties, or by any arts merely human. The clauſe would be appoſitely rendered in Latin, *inexorabilis ſicut orcus*: for it is this inflexibility of character, that is chiefly indicated by the original word rendered *cruel*. In this notion of that ſtate, as indeed in ſome other ſentiments on this ſubject, and even in the terms applied to it, there is a pretty cloſe coincidence with thoſe of the ancient pagans. When the Latin poet mentions the fatal conſequence of the venial treſpaſs of Orpheus (as it appeared to him) in turning about to take one look of his beloved Eurydice, before leaving the infernal regions, he ſays, *Ignoſcenda quidem*; but immediately correcting himſelf, adds, *ſcirent ſi ignoſcere manes.*

§ 11. I SHALL now proceed to examine ſome paſ-

* Iſa. v. 14. † xiv. 9. ‡ Defenſio adv. Bezam. Adverſarii Errores. § Job xxxviii. 17.
‖ De ſacra Poeſi Hebræorum, Præl. vii. ¶ Cant. viii. 6.

ſages in the New Teſtament, wherein the word occurs, that we may diſcover whether we ought to affix the ſame idea to it as to the correſponding term in the Old.—The firſt I ſhall produce is one, which, being originally in the Old Teſtament, is quoted and commented on in the New, and is conſequently one of the fitteſt for aſſiſting us in the diſcovery. Peter, in ſupporting the miſſion of his Maſter, in a ſpeech made to the inhabitants of Judea and Jeruſalem, on the famous day of Pentecoſt, alleges, amongſt other things, the prediction of the royal Pſalmiſt, part of which runs thus in the common verſion *: *Becauſe thou wilt not leave my ſoul in hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thine holy one to ſee corruption.* The paſſage is cited from the Pſalms †, in the very words of the Seventy, which are (as far as concerns the preſent queſtion) entirely conformable to the original Hebrew. As this prophecy might be underſtood by ſome to relate only to the Pſalmiſt himſelf, the Apoſtle ſhews how inapplicable it is to him, when literally explained. It plainly pointed to a reſurrection, and ſuch a reſurrection as would very ſoon follow death, that the ſoul ſhould not be left in hades, ſhould not remain in the manſions of departed ſpirits, but ſhould reanimate its body, before the latter had ſuffered corruption. *Brethren* ‡, ſays he, *let me ſpeak freely to you of the Patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his ſepulchre is with us to this day.* He has had no reſurrection. It was never pretended that he had. His body, like other bodies, has undergone corruption; and this gives ſufficient reaſon to believe that his ſoul has ſhared the fate of other ſouls, and that the prophecy was never meant of him, unleſs in a ſecondary ſenſe. *But* §, continues he, *being a prophet, he ſpake of the reſurrection of Chriſt*, or the Meſſiah: and, to ſhew how exactly both what related to the ſoul, and what related to the body, had their completion in the Meſſiah, adds, that *his ſoul was not left in hades, neither did his fleſh ſee corruption.* It has been argued, that this is an example of the figure ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, where the ſame ſentiment is expreſſed a ſecond time by a different phraſe. In ſome ſenſe this may be admitted; for, no doubt, either of the expreſſions would have ſerved for predicting the event. But it is enough for my purpoſe, that the writer, in uſing two, one regarding the ſoul, the other regarding the body, would undoubtedly adapt his language to the received opinions concerning each. And if ſo, *hades* was as truly, in their account, the ſoul's deſtiny after death, as corruption was the body's.

§ 12. I AM ſurpriſed, that a man of Dr. Taylor's critical abilities, as well as Oriental literature, ſhould produce the paſſage quoted by the Apoſtle, as an example to prove that *ſheol, the pit, death*, and *corruption*, are ſynonymous. The expreſſion, as we read it in the Pſalm, is (to ſay the leaſt) no evidence of this; but if we admit Peter to have been a juſt interpreter of the Pſalmiſt's meaning, which Simon ſeems very unwilling to admit, it contains a ſtrong evidence of the contrary: for, in his comment, he clearly diſtinguiſhes the deſtiny of the *ſoul*, which is to be conſigned to *ſheol* or *hades*, from that of the *body* or fleſh, which is to be conſigned to *corruption*. Nor is there, in this, the ſlighteſt appearance of an unuſual or myſtical application of the words. The other examples brought by that author, in his very valuable Hebrew Concordance, are equally exceptionable.

He proceeds on the ſuppoſition, that no account can be given, why certain phraſes are often found coupled together, but by ſaying that they are ſynonymous: whereas, in the preſent caſe, it is much more naturally accounted for, by ſaying, that the events to which they relate, are commonly concomitant. We ought never to recur to tautology for the ſolution of a difficulty, unleſs when the ordinary application of the words admits no other reſource. This is far from being the caſe in the inſtances referred to. Of the like kind are the arguments founded on ſuch figurative expreſſions, as, digging into *hades*; Korah's deſcending alive into it; Jonah's being there, when in the belly of the great fiſh; the foundations of the mountains, or the roots of the trees, reaching to it; which are all evident hyperboles, and to which we find expreſſions entirely ſimilar in ancient authors, both Greek and Latin. Thus, Virgil, deſcribing the ſtorm in which Æneas was involved at ſea, ſays,

> Tollimur in cœlum, curvato gurgite, et iidem
> Subductâ ad manes imos deſcendimus undâ.

Again, ſpeaking of an oak,

> Ipſa hæret ſcopulis; et quantum vertice ad auras
> Æthereas, tantum radice in Tartara tendit.

Yet, theſe figures, as far as I have heard, have never created any doubt among critics, concerning the ordinary acceptation of the words *tartarus* and *imi manes*. No pretence has been made that the one ever meant, when uſed not tropically, but properly, the bottom of the ſea, and the other a few yards under ground. Indeed, if a man were to employ the ſame mode of reaſoning, in regard to the Latin terms that relate to this ſubject, which has been employed, in regard to the Hebrew; we ſhould conclude, that *ſepulchrum* and *infernus* are ſynonymous, *anima* and *corpus*, *manes* and *cinis*, upon evidence incomparably ſtronger than that we have for inferring, than *ſheol* and *keber* are ſo. Of the firſt two the Latin poet ſays, *Animamque ſepulchro condimus.*

* Acts ii. 27. † Pſal. xvi. 10. ‡ Acts ii. 29. § 30, 31.

rondimus. If *anima* be here uſed for *the ſoul*, agreeably to its ordinary and proper acceptation, he aſſigns it the ſame habitation as is given to the body after death, to wit, the *ſepulchre*: and if it be uſed for *the body*, the words *corpus* and *anima* are ſtrangely confounded, even by the beſt writers. As we have *anima* here for *corpus*, we have, in other places, *corpus* for *anima*. For, ſpeaking of Charon's ferrying the ſouls of the deceaſed over Styx, he ſays,

Et ferrugineâ ſubvectat corpora cymbâ.

Now, what Virgil here calls *corpora*, and a few lines after, more explicitly, *defunctâque corpora vitâ*, he had a very little before expreſſed by a phraſe of the contrary import, *tenues ſine corpore vitas*, the one being *the body without the life*, the other *the life without the body*. That *cinis* and *manes* are in like manner confounded, we have an example from the ſame author:

Id cinerem, aut manes credis curare ſepultos?

Here, if *ſepultos* mean *buried*, *cinis* and *manes* are ſynonymous: if *manes* mean *ghoſts*, then *ſepultos* is equivalent to *deductos ad infernum*. Yet it would not be eaſy to ſay to what trope the author has, in theſe inſtances, had recourſe, if it be not the catachreſis. Nor is this promiſcuous application of the words peculiar to the poets. Livy, the hiſtorian, uſes the word *manes* in proſe with equal latitude: *Sepulchra diruta, nudati manes*.

To theſe inſtances of confuſion in the meanings of the words mentioned, nothing parallel has been alleged from the Hebrew Scriptures, except only that נפש ſometimes, like *anima* in the example above quoted, means *a dead body*. Yet nobody conſiders the examples aforeſaid as invalidating thoſe diſtinctions in Latin, which an uſage incomparably more extenſive has eſtabliſhed in the language. With much leſs reaſon then can a few expreſſions, confeſſedly hyberbolical and figurative, be pleaded for ſubverting the uniform acceptation of the Hebrew words in queſtion, in their proper and natural application. Taylor's remark, that *keber* grave, is one particular cavity, &c. and that *ſheol* is a collective name for all the graves, &c. tends more to perplex the ſubject than to explain it. He would hardly be thought to apprehend diſtinctly the import of the Latin words, who ſhould define them by telling us, that *ſepulchrum* is one particular cavity digged for the interment of a dead perſon, and that *infernus* is a collective name for all the *ſepulchra*, &c. The definition would be both obſcure and unjuſt; yet, from what has been ſhown, more might be produced to juſtify it, than can be advanced in vindication of the other.

§ 13. BESIDES, we have another clear proof from the New Teſtament, that *hades* denotes the intermediate ſtate of ſouls between death and the general reſurrection. In the Apocalypſe *, we learn that *death and hades*, by our tranſlators rendered *hell* as uſual, *ſhall*, immediately after the general judgment, *be caſt into the lake of fire. This is the ſecond death*. In other words, the death which conſiſts in the ſeparation of the ſoul from the body, and the ſtate of ſouls intervening between death and judgment, ſhall be no more. To the wicked theſe ſhall be ſucceeded by a more terrible death, the damnation of gehenna, *hell* properly ſo called. Indeed in this ſacred Book, the commencement, as well as the deſtruction of this intermediate ſtate, are ſo clearly marked, as to render it almoſt impoſſible to miſtake them. In a preceding chapter †, we learn that *hades* follows cloſe at the heels of death; and, from the other paſſage quoted, that both are involved in one common ruin at the univerſal judgment. Whereas if we interpret ἀδης *hell*, in the Chriſtian ſenſe of the word, the whole paſſage is rendered nonſenſe. *Hell* is repreſented as being caſt into *hell*: for ſo the lake of fire, which is in this place alſo denominated the ſecond death, is univerſally interpreted.

§ 14. THE Apoſtle Paul, without naming *hades*, conveys to us the ſame idea of the ſtate of ſouls departed ‡. *The righteouſneſs which is of faith, ſpeaketh on this wiſe, Say not in thine heart, who ſhall aſcend into heaven? (that is to bring Chriſt down from above;) or, who ſhall deſcend into the deep?* εις την αβυσσον into the abyſs, *(that is, to bring up Chriſt again from the dead)* —that is, faith doth not require, for our ſatisfaction, things impracticable, either to ſcale the heavens, or to explore the profound receſſes of departed ſpirits. The word here uſed ſhows this. It is αβυσσος, that is, a pit or gulph, if not bottomleſs, at leaſt of an indeterminable depth. The very antitheſis of deſcending into the deep, and aſcending into heaven, alſo ſhows it. There would be a moſt abſurd diſparity in the different members of this illuſtration, if no more were to be underſtood by the abyſs than the grave, ſince nothing is more practicable for the living than a deſcent thither. The women, who went to viſit our Lord's ſepulchre, did actually deſcend into it §. Beſides, to call the grave the abyſs, is entirely unexampled. Let it be alſo obſerved, that it is not ſaid *to bring Chriſt up from the grave*, but *from the dead*; for which end to bring back the ſoul is in the firſt place neceſſary. I do not ſay that the Greek word αβυσσος, or the correſpondent Hebrew word תהום *thehom*, is confined to the ſignification here given it. I know that it often means

* xx. 14. † vi. 8 ‡ Rom. x. 6, 8. § Mark xvi. 5. Luke xxiv. 3.

means the ocean, becauſe conceived to be of an unfathomable depth, and may indeed be applied to any thing of which the ſame quality can be affirmed.

§ 15. So much for the literal ſenſe of the word *hades*, which, as has been obſerved, implies properly neither *hell* nor the *grave*, but the place or ſtate of departed ſouls. I know that it has been ſaid, and ſpeciouſly ſupported, that in the Moſaical economy, there was no expreſs revelation of the exiſtence of ſouls after death. Admitting this to be in ſome ſenſe true, the Iſraelites were not without ſuch intimations of a future ſtate as types, and figures, and emblematical predictions, could give them: yet certain it is, that life and immortality were, in an eminent manner, brought to light only by the Goſpel. But, from whatever ſource they derived their opinions, that they had opinions on this ſubject, though dark and confuſed, is manifeſt, as from many other circumſtances, ſo particularly from the practice of witchcraft and necromancy, which prevailed among them, and the power they aſcribed to ſorcerers, juſtly or unjuſtly, it matters not, of evoking the ghoſts of the deceaſed.

The whole ſtory of the witch of Endor * is an irrefragable evidence of this. For, however much people may differ in their manner of explaining the phenomena which it preſents to us, judicious and impartial men, whoſe minds are not preoccupied with a ſyſtem, can hardly differ as to the evidence it affords, that the exiſtence of ſpirits in a ſeparate ſtate, was an article of the popular belief, and that it was thought poſſible, by certain ſecret arts, to maintain an intercourſe with them. Our queſtion here is, not what was expreſsly revealed to that people on this ſubject, but what appear to have been the notions commonly entertained concerning it? or what it was which the learned Biſhop of London ſtyles †, the *infernum poeticum* of the Hebrews? Indeed, the artifices employed by their wizards and necromancers alluded to by Iſaiah, of returning anſwers in a feigned voice, which appeared to thoſe preſent, as proceeding from under the ground ‡, is a demonſtration of the prevalence of the ſentiments I have been illuſtrating, in regard both to the exiſtence, and to the abode of ſouls departed. For that theſe were the oracles intended to be conſulted, is manifeſt from the Prophet's upbraiding them with it, as an abſurdity, that the living ſhould recur for counſel, not to their God, but to the dead. It is well expreſſed in Houbigant's tranſlation, *Itane pro vivis mortui interrogantur* §. But what can be clearer to this purpoſe than the law itſelf, whereby ſuch practices are prohibited? ‖ *There ſhall not be found among you any one that maketh his ſon or his daughter to paſs through the fire, or that uſeth divination, or an obſerver of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a conſulter with familiar ſpirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer.* This laſt character is not expreſſed in the original, as in the Engliſh tranſlation, by a ſingle word, but by a periphraſis, דרש אל חמתים *doreſh el hamathim*, which, rendered literally, is, *one who conſulteth the dead.* It is accordingly tranſlated by the Seventy επερωτων τους νεκρους, and by Houbigant, *Qui mortuos interroget.*

§ 16. I SHALL add a few things in regard to the metaphorical uſe of the term. I have obſerved that *heaven* and *hades* are commonly ſet in oppoſition to each other; the one is conceived to be the higheſt object, the other the loweſt. From what is literally or locally ſo; the tranſition is very natural (inſomuch that we find traces of it in all languages) to what is figuratively ſo; that is, what expreſſes a glorious and happy ſtate on the one hand, or a humble and miſerable ſtate on the other. In this way it is uſed by our Lord¶, *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, ſhalt be brought down to hades,* εως αδου. As the city of Capernaum was never literally raiſed to *heaven*, we have no reaſon to believe that it was to be literally brought down to *hades*. But as, by the former expreſſion, we are given to underſtand, that it was become a flouriſhing city, or, as ſome think, that it had obtained great ſpiritual advantages; ſo, by the latter, that it ſhould be brought to the loweſt degree of abaſement and wretchedneſs.

§ 17. ANOTHER paſſage, in which the application of the word is figurative, we have in that celebrated promiſe made to Peter**, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell,* πυλαι αδου, the gates of hades, *ſhall not prevail againſt it.* It is by death, and by it only, that the ſpirit enters into *hades*. The gate of *hades* is therefore a very natural periphraſis for death; inſomuch that, without any poſitive evidence, we ſhould naturally conclude this to be the meaning of the phraſe. But we have ſufficient evidence, both ſacred and profane, that this is the meaning. The phraſe occurs in the Septuagint in the thankſgiving of Hezekiah, after his miraculous recovery from the mortal diſeaſe he had been ſeized with ††. I ſaid, *I ſhall go to the gates of the grave,* εν πυλαις αδου. It follows, *I am deprived of the reſidue of my years.* Nothing can be plainer than that πυλαι αδου here means *death*, in other words, I ſhall die and be deprived of the reſidue of my years. But though the phraſe be the ſame (for πυλαι αδου is a literal verſion of the Hebrew) with that uſed by our Lord, our tranſlators have not liked to make Hezekiah,

* 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, &c. † Notes on ch. xiii. and xiv of Iſaiah. ‡ Iſa. xxix. 4. § Iſa. viii. 19. ‖ Deut. xviii. 10, 11.
¶ Matth. xi. 23 ** Matth. xvi. 18. †† Iſaiah xxxviii. 10.

kiah, who was a good man, ſpeak as if he thought himſelf going to hell, and have therefore rendered it *the grave*.

Another example we have in the Wiſdom of Solomon, which, though not canonical Scripture, is, in a queſtion of criticiſm, a good authority *. *Thou haſt power of life and death, thou leadeſt to the gates of hades,* εις πυλας ᾅδου, *and bringeſt up again.* This paſſage is as little ſuſceptible of doubts as the former. The claſſical uſe of this phraſe is the ſame with that of the inſpired writers. Homer makes Achilles ſay, as rendered by our Engliſh poet †:

> Who can think one thing, and another tell,
> My ſoul deteſts him as the gates of hell;
> εικος οϊδαο πυλῃσι.

that is, I hate him as death, or I hate him mortally. To ſay then that the gates of *hades* ſhall not prevail againſt the church, is, in other words, to ſay, It ſhall never die, it ſhall never be extinct. Le Clerc, though meaning the ſame thing (as appears by his note), has expreſſed it inaccurately: "Les portes de la mort ne la ſurmonteront point;" *The gates of death ſhall not ſurmount it.* We ſee at once how appoſitely *death* is called *the gates of hades.* But what ſhall we call the gates of death? Not death itſelf, ſurely. They muſt be *diſeaſes*; for by theſe we are brought to to death. But in this ſenſe we cannot apply the promiſe. For many direful diſeaſes has the church been afflicted with, if the introduction of the groſſeſt errors, the moſt ſuperſtitious practices and ſenſeleſs diſputes, are to be accounted ſuch; but they have not hitherto proved mortal, and, we have reaſon to believe never ſhall.

§ 18. In the exclamation adopted by the Apoſtle ‡, *O death, where is thy ſting? O grave,* ᾅδη, *where is thy victory?* we cannot ſay ſo properly, that the words *death* and *hades* are uſed figuratively, as the words *ſting* and *victory*, with which they are accompanied. In regard to the ſenſe, there can be no doubt. It is manifeſtly the Apoſtle's view to ſignify that, whatever might have been formerly an object of terror in either *death* or *hades*, is removed by Jeſus Chriſt, inſomuch that in theſe very things the true diſciples find matter of joy and exultation.

§ 19. But is there not one paſſage, it may be ſaid, in which the word ᾅδης muſt be underſtood as ſynonymous with γεεννα, and conſequently muſt denote the place of final puniſhment prepared for the wicked, or *hell* in the Chriſtian acceptation of the term? Ye have it in the ſtory of the rich man and Lazarus §. *In hell,* εν τω ᾅδῃ, *he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and ſeeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his boſom.* This is the only paſſage in holy writ which ſeems to give countenance to the opinion that ᾅδης ſometimes means the ſame thing as γεεννα. Here it is repreſented as a place of puniſhment. The rich man is ſaid to be tormented there in the midſt of flames. Theſe things will deſerve to be examined narrowly. It is plain, that in the Old Teſtament, the moſt profound ſilence is obſerved in regard to the ſtate of the deceaſed, their joys or ſorrows, happineſs or miſery. It is repreſented to us rather by negative qualities than by poſitive, by its ſilence, its darkneſs, its being inacceſſible, unleſs by preternatural means, to the living, and their ignorance about it. Thus much in general ſeems always to have been preſumed concerning it. That it is not a ſtate of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accompliſhment of any important purpoſe, good or bad. In moſt reſpects, however, there was a reſemblance in their notions on this ſubject, to thoſe of the moſt ancient heathens.

But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathens, remained invariably the ſame. And from the time of the captivity, more eſpecially from the time of the ſubjection of the Jews, firſt to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a cloſer intercourſe with pagans, they inſenſibly imbibed many of their ſentiments, particularly on thoſe ſubject whereon their laws was ſilent, and wherein, by conſequence, they conſidered themſelves as at greater freedom. On this ſubject of a future ſtate, we find a conſiderable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Saviour's time, from thoſe which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghoſts of the departed were ſuſceptible both of enjoyment and of ſuffering, they were led to ſuppoſe a ſort of retribution in that ſtate, for their merit or demerit in the preſent. The Jews did not indeed adopt the pagan fables on this ſubject, nor did they expreſs themſelves entirely in the ſame manner; but the general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide. The Greek *hades* they found well adapted to expreſs the Hebrew *ſheol*. This they came to conceive as including different ſorts of habitations for ghoſts of different characters. And though they did not receive the terms *Elyſium* or *Elyſian fields*, as ſuitable appellations for the regions peopled by good ſpirits, they took inſtead of them, as better adapted to their own theology, *the garden of Eden* or *Paradiſe*, a name originally Perſian, by which the word anſwering to *garden*, eſpecially when applied to Eden, had commonly been rendered by the Seventy. To denote the ſame ſtate, they ſometimes uſed the phraſe *Abraham's boſom*, a metaphor borrowed from the manner

* xvi. 13. † Iliad B. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 55. § Luke xvi. 23.

ner in which they reclined at meals. But, on the other hand, to expreſs the unhappy ſituation of the wicked in that intermediate ſtate, they do not ſeem to have declined the uſe of the word *tartarus*. The Apoſtle Peter, ſays * of evil angels, that *God caſt them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkneſs, to be reſerved unto judgment*. So it ſtands in the common verſion, though neither γεεννα nor ἁδης are in the orignal, where the expreſſion is, σειραις ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρεδωκεν εις κρισιν τετηρημενους. The word is not γεεννα; for that comes after judgment; but ταρταρος, which is, as it were, the priſon of hades, wherein criminals are kept till the general judgment. And as, in ordinary uſe of the Greek word, it was comprehended under *hades*, as a part; it ought, unleſs we had ſome poſitive reaſon to the contrary, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, to be underſtood ſo here. There is then no inconſiſtency in maintaining that the rich man, though in torments, was not in *gehenna*, but in that part of *hades* called *tartarus*, where we have ſeen already that ſpirits reſerved for judgment are detained in darkneſs.

That there is, in a lower degree, a reward of the righteous, and a puniſhment of the wicked, in the ſtate intervening between death and the reſurrection, is no more repugnant to the divine perfections, than that there ſhould be (as, in the courſe of providence, there often are) manifeſt recompences of eminent virtues, and of enormous crimes, in this preſent world. Add to this, that Joſephus, in the account he gives of the opinions of the Phariſees, or thoſe Jews who believed a future ſtate, mentions expreſsly the rewards of the virtuous, and the puniſhments of the vicious, in *hades*, or under the earth, which is, as was obſerved before, another expreſſion for the ſame thing †. From his repreſentation we ſhould conclude, that, in his time, a reſurrection and future judgment, as underſtood by the Chriſtians, were not univerſally the doctrine, even of the Phariſees; but that the prevalent and diſtinguiſhing opinion was, that the ſoul ſurvived the body, that vicious ſouls would ſuffer an everlaſting impriſonment in *hades*, and that the ſouls of the virtuous would both be happy there, and, in proceſs of time, obtain the privilege of tranſmigrating into other bodies. The immortality of human ſouls, and the traſmigration of the good, ſeem to have been all that they comprehended in the phraſe αναστασις των νεκρων. Indeed, the words ſtrictly denote no more than renewal of life.

Their ſentiments on this topic naturally recal to our remembrance ſome of thoſe exhibited by Virgil, in the ſixth book of the Æneid. That this Pythagorean dogma was become pretty general among the Jews, appears even from ſome paſſages in the Goſpels. The queſtion put by the diſciples ‡, *Who ſinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?* and ſome popular opinions concerning Jeſus, whom they knew to have been born and brought up among themſelves, that he was Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the ancient Prophets §, manifeſtly preſuppoſe the doctrine of the tranſmigration. It is alſo in alluſion to this, that the Jewiſh author of the book of Wiſdom, has, as it is rendered in the common tranſlation, thus expreſſed himſelf: *I was a witty child, and had a good ſpirit; yea, rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled*: αγαθος ων ηλθον εις σωμα αμιαντον ‖. Yet we have reaſon, from the New Teſtament, to think that theſe tenets were not, at that time, univerſal among the Phariſees, but that ſome entertained juſter notions of a reſurrection, and that afterwards, the opinions of the Talmudiſts, on this article, had a much greater conformity to the doctrine of the Goſpel, than the opinions of ſome of their predeceſſors in and before our Saviour's time.

§ 20. ACCORDING to this explication, the rich man and Lazarus were both in *hades*, though in very different ſituations, the latter in the manſions of the happy, and the former in thoſe of the wretched. Let us ſee how the circumſtances mentioned, and the expreſſions uſed, in the parable, will ſuit this hypotheſis. Firſt, though they are ſaid to be at a great diſtance from each other, they are ſtill within ſight and hearing. This would have been too groſs a violation of probability, if the one were conſidered as inhabiting the higheſt heavens, and the other as placed in the infernal regions. Again, the expreſſions uſed, are

* 2 Peter ii. 4.

† Αθανατον τε ισχυν ταις ψυχαις πιστις αυτοις ειναι, και υπο χθονος δικαιωσεις τε και τιμας ὁις αρετης η κακιας επιτηδευσις εν τω βιω γενηται, και ταις μεν εἰργμον ἀιδιον προσιθεσθαι, ταις δε ραστωνη του αναβιουν. Antiq. lib. xviii c. 2. Ψυχην δε πασαν μεν αφθαρτον μεταβαινειν δε εις ἑτερον σωμα, την των αγαθων μονην της δε των φαυλων, αιδιωτιμορια κολαζεσθαι. Bell. Lib. ii. c. 12. Ἑτερον σωμα is an expreſſion by no means parallel, as Dr. Jennings ſeems to have thought [Jewiſh Antiquities, B. i. c. 10.] to that uſed of our Lord's transfiguration [Luke, ix. 29.], το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ἑτερον. Ειδος is no more than the appearance. Now to ſay that the body into which the ſoul paſſes is another body, and to ſay that it has another appearance, are two expreſſions which no perſon who reflects, will confound as equivalent. That there are ſome things, however, which would lead one to infer that the opinions of the Phariſees on this article were more conformable to the Chriſtian doctrine, than is implied in the words of Joſephus, is not to be diſſembled. But the difficulty reſulting hence is more eaſily removed by admitting, what is powiſe improbable, that there was not then among them an exact uniformity of opinion, than by recurring on either ſide to a mode of criticiſm which the language will not bear.

‡ John ix. 2. § Matth. xvi. 14. ‖ Wiſd. viii. 19, 20.

are ſuch as entirely ſuit this explanation, and no other; for, firſt, the diſtance from each other is mentioned, but no hint that the one was higher in ſituation than the other; ſecondly, the terms, whereby motion from the one to the other is expreſſed, are ſuch as are never employed in expreſſing motion to or from heaven, but, always, when the places are on a level, or nearly ſo. Thus, Lazarus, when dead, is ſaid * απενεχθηναι, *to be carried away*, not ανενεχθηναι, *to be carried up*, by angels into Abraham's boſom; whereas, it is the latter of theſe, or one ſimilarly compounded, that is always uſed, where an aſſumption into heaven is ſpoken of. Thus, the ſame writer, in ſpeaking of our Lord's aſcenſion, ſays †, ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον, and Mark ‡, in relation to the event, ſays, ανελημφθη εις τον ουρανον, *he was taken up into heaven*. Theſe words are alſo uſed, wherever one is ſaid to be conveyed from a lower to a higher ſituation. But what is ſtill more deciſive in this way; where mention is made of paſſing from Abraham to the rich man, and inverſely, the verbs employed are, διαβαινω and διαπεραω, words which always denote motion on the ſame ground or level; as, paſſing a river or lake, paſſing through the Red Sea, or paſſing from Aſia to Macedonia. But, when heaven is ſpoken of as the termination to which, or from which, the paſſage is made, the word is, invariably, either in the firſt caſe, αναβαινω, and in the ſecond, καταβαινω, or ſome word ſimiliarly formed, and of the ſame import. Thus, both the circumſtances of the ſtory, and the expreſſions employed in it, confirm the explanation I have given. For, if the ſacred penmen wrote to be underſtood, they muſt have employed their words and phraſes in conformity to the current uſage of thoſe for whom they wrote.

§ 21. WHEN our Saviour, therefore, ſaid to the penitent thief upon the croſs §, *To-day ſhalt thou be with me in paradiſe*; he ſaid nothing that contradicts what is affirmed of his deſcent into *hades*, in the Pſalms, in the Acts, or in the Apoſtles creed. *Paradiſe* is another name for what is, in the parable, called Abraham's boſom. But it may be urged on the other ſide, that Paul has given ſome reaſon to conclude that paradiſe and heaven, or the ſeat of the glorious hierarchy, are the ſame. *It is not*, ſays he ||, *expedient for me doubtleſs to glory: I will come to viſions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Chriſt above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth), ſuch an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew ſuch a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth), how that he was caught up into paradiſe, and heard unſpeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.* The Jews make mention of three heavens. The firſt is properly the atmoſphere where the birds fly, and the clouds are ſuſpended. The ſecond is above the firſt, and is what we call the viſible firmament, wherein the ſun, moon, and ſtars appear. The third, to us inviſible, is conceived to be above the ſecond, and therefore ſometimes ſtyled the heaven of heavens. This they conſidered as the place of the throne of God, and the habitation of the holy angels. Now it is evident, that if in the ſecond and fourth verſes, he ſpeak of one viſion or revelation only, paradiſe and heaven are the ſame; not ſo, if in theſe he ſpeak of two different revelations. My opinion is, that they are two, and I ſhall aſſign my reaſons. Firſt, he ſpeaks of them as more than one, and that not only in introducing them. *I will come to viſions and revelations*; for ſometimes, it muſt be owned, the plural is uſed in expreſſing a ſubject indefinitely; but afterwards, in referring to what he had related, he ſays ¶ *leſt I ſhould be exalted above meaſure, through the abundance of the revelations*, των αποκαλυψεων. Secondly, they are related preciſely as two diſtinct events, and coupled together by the connexive particle. Thirdly, there is a repetition of his doubts **, in regard to the reality of his tranſlation, which, if the whole relate to a ſingle event, was not only ſuperfluous, but improper. This repetition, however, was neceſſary, if what is related in the third and fourth verſes, be a different fact from what is told in the ſecond, and if he was equally uncertain, whether it paſſed in viſion or in reality. Fourthly, if all the three verſes regard only one revelation, there is a tautology in the manner of relating it, unexampled in the Apoſtle's writings. I might urge, as a fifth reaſon, the opinion of all Chriſtian antiquity, Origen alone excepted. And this in a queſtion of philology, is not without its weight.

I ſhall only add that, though, in both verſes, the words in the Engliſh Bible are *caught up*, there is nothing in the original anſwering to the particle *up*. The Apoſtle has very properly employed here the word ἁρπαζω, expreſſive more of the ſuddenneſs of the event, and of his own paſſiveneſs, than of the direction of the motion ††. The only other place in which παραδεισος occurs is in the Apocalyſe ‡‡. *To him that overcometh*

* Luke xvi. 22. † xxiv. 51. ‡ Mark xvi. 19. § Luke xxiii. 43. || 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2, 3, 4.
¶ verſe 7. ** verſe 2, 3.

†† The learned reader may peruſe the following paſſage from Epiphanius on this ſubject, in oppoſition to Origen. Ουδε ὁ αποστολος υποτιθεται τον παραδεισον ειναι εν τριτω ουρανω, τους λεγοντας ακριβεστερον λογων ετι σαμενους· οιδα γαρ ἁρπαγεντα ἑως τριτου λεγων ουρανου. και οιδα τον τοιουτον ανθρωπον, ειτε εν σωματι, ειτε χωρις σωματος, ὁ θεος οιδεν, ὁτι ἡρπαγη εις τον παραδεισον. δυο αποκαλυψεις μεγαλας ἑωρακεναι μυησει, δις αναληφθεις εναργως, ἁπαξ μεν ἑως τριτης ερανου, ἁπαξ δε εις τον παραδεισον. το γαρ οιδα ἁρπαγεντα τον τοιουτον ἑως τριτης ερανου, ιδιως αποκαλυψιν αυτω κατα τον τριτον αναληφθεντι πεφηνεναι συνησει. το δε, και οιδα παλιν επιφερομενον τον τοιουτον ανθρωπον, ειτε εν σωματι, ειτε εκτος του σωματος, εις τον παραδεισον, ἑτερᾳ αυθις αυτω αναφερωσθαι κατα τον παραδεισον αποκαλυψιν δεικνυσι. Epiph. Lib. ii. Hær, 44. ‡‡ Rev. ii. 7.

cometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midſt του παραδεισου *of the paradiſe of God.* Here our Lord, no doubt, ſpeaks of heaven, but as he plainly alludes to the ſtate of matters in the garden of Eden, where our firſt parents were placed, and where the tree of life grew, it can only be underſtood as a figurative expreſſion of the promiſe of eternal life, forfeited by Adam, but recovered by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

§ 22. To conclude this long diſcuſſion, I ſhall obſerve that, though we may diſcover hence, pretty exactly, the general ſentiments entertained on theſe ſubjects at the time, and the ſtyle uſed concerning them, we are not to imagine that the expreſſions are to be rigorouſly interpreted, in order to come at the true doctrine upon thoſe articles, but ſolely in order to diſcover the popular opinions of the age. In regard to theſe, the opinions of the age, there ought to be a cloſe attention to the letter of what is ſpoken; but, in regard to the other, the doctrine of holy writ, our attention ought to be moſtly to the ſpirit. Thus it appears to me the plain doctrine of Scripture, that there are ſuch ſtates as I have mentioned, and that the uſe and nature them is ſuch as has been ſaid. But in reſpect of their ſituation, expreſſions implying that *hades* is under the earth, and that the ſeat of the bleſſed is above the ſtars, ought to be regarded merely as attempts to accommodate what is ſpoken to vulgar apprehenſion and language. Of the like kind is the practice, ſo frequent in holy writ, of aſcribing human paſſions, nay, and human organs and members, to the Deity. The ſame may be ſaid of what we hear of plants and trees in paradiſe, of eating and drinking, or of fire and brimſtone in either *hades* or *gehenna*. We have no more reaſon to underſtand theſe literally, than we have to believe that the ſoul, when ſeparated from the body, can feel torment in its tongue, or that a little cold water can relieve it.

§ 23. I AM not ignorant that the doctrine of an intermediate ſtate between death and the reſurrection, has been of late ſtrenuouſly combated by ſome learned and ingenious men; amongſt whom we muſt reckon that excellent divine and firm friend to freedom of enquiry, Dr. Law, the preſent biſhop of Carliſle *. I honour his diſpoſition, and have the greateſt reſpect for his talents; but at the ſame time that I acknowledge he has, with much ability, ſupported the ſide he has eſpouſed, I have never felt myſelf, on this head, convinced, though ſometimes perplexed, by his reaſoning. It is foreign to my purpoſe to enter into a minute diſcuſſion of controverted points in theology; and therefore I ſhall only, in paſſing, make a few remarks on this controverſy, as it is cloſely connected with my ſubject.

Firſt, I remark that the argumentson which the deniers of that ſtate chiefly build, ariſe, in my opinion, from a miſapprehenſion of the import of ſome ſcriptural expreſſions. κοιμαω, *to ſleep*, are words often applied to the *dead*; but this application is no more than a metaphorical euphemiſm derived from the reſemblance which a dead body bears to the body of a perſon aſleep. Traces of this idiom may be found in all languages, whatever be the popular belief about the ſtate of the dead. They often occur in the Old Teſtament; yet it has been ſhown that the common doctrine of the Orientals favoured the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſouls of the deceaſed. But if it did not, and if, as ſome ſuppoſe, the ancient Jews were, on all articles relating to another life, no better than Sadducees; this ſhows the more ſtrongly, that ſuch metaphors, ſo frequent in their writings, could be derived ſolely from bodily likeneſs, and having no reference to a reſurrection, could be employed ſolely for the ſake of avoiding a diſagreeable or ominous word. I own, at the ſame time, that Chriſtians have been the more ready to adopt ſuch expreſſions, as their doctrine of the reſurrection of the body, preſented to their minds an additional analogy between the bodies of the deceaſed and the bodies of thoſe aſleep, that of being one day awaked. But I ſee no reaſon to imagine that, in this uſe, they carried their thoughts further than to the corporeal and viſible reſemblance now mentioned. Another miſtake about the import of ſcriptural terms, is in the ſenſe which has been given to the word αναστασις. They confine it by a uſe derived merely from modern European tongues, to that renovation which we call the reunion of the ſoul and the body, and which is to take place at the laſt day. I have ſhown, in another place †, that this is not always the ſenſe of the term in the New Teſtament.

I remark, ſecondly, that many expreſſions of ſcripture, in the natural and obvious ſenſe, imply that an intermediate and ſeparate ſtate of the ſoul is actually to ſucceed death. Such are the words of our Lord to the penitent thief upon the croſs ‡, Stephen's dying petition §, the compariſons which the Apoſtle Paul makes in different places ‖, between the enjoyment which true Chriſtians can attain by their continuance in this world, and that which they enter on at their departure out of it, and ſeveral other paſſages. Let the words referred to be read by any judicious perſon, either in the original, or in the common tranſlation, which is ſufficiently exact for this purpoſe; and let him, ſetting aſide all theory or ſyſtem, ſay candidly, whether

* Dr. Law was living when theſe Diſſertations were in the hands of the printer.
† Notes on Matth. xxii. 23. and 32.
‡ Luke xxiii. 43. § Acts vii. 59. ‖ 2 Cor. v. 6. &c. Philip i. 21.

whether they would not be underſtood, by the groſs of mankind, as preſuppoſing that the ſoul may, and will, exiſt ſeparately from the body, and be ſuſceptible of happineſs or miſery in that ſtate. If any thing could add to the native evidence of the expreſſions, it would be the unnatural meanings that are put upon them, in order to diſguiſe that evidence. What ſhall we ſay of the metaphyſical diſtinction introduced, for this purpoſe, between abſolute and relative time? The Apoſtle Paul, they are ſenſible, ſpeaks of the ſaints as admitted to enjoyment in the preſence of God, immediately after death. Now, to palliate the direct contradiction there is in this to their doctrine, that the vital principle, which is all they mean by the ſoul, remains extinguiſhed between death and the reſurrection, they remind us of the difference there is between abſolute or real, and relative or apparent, time. They admit that, if the Apoſtle be underſtood as ſpeaking of real time, what is ſaid flatly contradicts their ſyſtem; but, ſay they, his words muſt be interpreted as ſpoken only of apparent time. He talks indeed of entering on a ſtate of enjoyment, immediately after death, though there may be many thouſands of years between the one and the other; for he means only, that when that ſtate ſhall commence, however diſtant in reality the time may be, the perſon entering on it will not be ſenſible of that diſtance, and conſequently there will be to him an apparent coincidence with the moment of his death. But does the Apoſtle any where give a hint that this is his meaning? or is it what any man would naturally diſcover from his words. That it is exceedingly remote from the common uſe of language, I believe hardly any of thoſe who favour this ſcheme, will be partial enough to deny. Did the ſacred penmen then mean to put a cheat upon the world, and, by the help of an equivocal expreſſion, to flatter men with the hope of entering, the inſtant they expire, on a ſtate of felicity, when, in fact, they knew that it would be many ages before it would take place? But, were the hypotheſis about the extinction of the mind between death and the reſurrection well founded, the apparent coincidence they ſpeak of, is not ſo clear as they ſeem to think it. For my part, I cannot regard it as an axiom, and I never heard of any who attempted to demonſtrate it. To me it appears merely a corollary from Mr. Locke's doctrine, which derives our conceptions of time from the ſucceſſion of our ideas, which, whether true or falſe, is a doctrine to be found only among certain philoſophers, and which, we may reaſonably believe, never came into the heads of thoſe to whom the goſpel in the apoſtolic age was announced.

I remark, thirdly, that even the curious equivocation (or, perhaps more properly, mental reſervation), that has been deviſed for them, will not, in every caſe, ſave the credit of apoſtolical veracity. The words of Paul to the Corinthians are, *Knowing, that whilſt we are at home in the body, we are abſent from the Lord*; again, *We are willing rather to be abſent from the body, and preſent with the Lord.* Could ſuch expreſſions have been uſed by him, if he had held it impoſſible to be with the Lord, or indeed any where, without the body; and that, whatever the change was which was made by death, he could not be in the preſence of the Lord, till he returned to the body? Abſence from the body, and preſence with the Lord, were never, therefore, more unfortunately combined, than in this illuſtration. Things are combined here as coincident, which, on the hypotheſis of thoſe gentlemen, are incompatible. If recourſe be had to the original, the expreſſions in Greek are, if poſſible, ſtill ſtronger. They are οι ενδημουντες εν τω σωματι, *thoſe who dwell in the body*, who are εκδημουντες απο του Κυριου, *at a diſtance from the Lord*; as, on the contrary, they are οι εκδημουντες εκ του σωματος, *thoſe who have travelled out of the body*, who are οι ενδημουντες προς τον Κυριον, *thoſe who reſide*, or *are preſent with the Lord.* In the paſſage to the Philippians alſo, the commencement of his preſence with the Lord is repreſented as coincident, not with his return to the body, but with his leaving it, with the diſſolution, not with the reſtoration, of the union.

The fourth, and only other remark I ſhall make, on this ſubject, is, that from the tenor of the New Teſtament, the ſacred writers appear to proceed on the ſuppoſition, that the ſoul and the body are naturally diſtinct and ſeparable, and that the ſoul is ſuſceptible of pain or pleaſure in a ſtate of ſeparation. It were endleſs to enumerate all the places which evince this. The ſtory of the rich man and Lazarus *; the laſt words of our Lord upon the croſs †, and of Stephen when dying; Paul's doubts whether he was in the body or out of the body, when he was tranſlated to the third heaven, and paradiſe ‡; our Lord's words to Thomas, to ſatisfy him that he was not a ſpirit §; and, to conclude, the expreſs mention of the denial of ſpirits, as one of the errors of the Sadducees ‖; *For the Sadducees ſay that there is no reſurrection, neither angel, nor ſpirit*; μηδε αγγελον μηδε πνευμα. All theſe are irrefragable evidences of the general opinion, on this ſubject, of both Jews and Chriſtians. By *ſpirit*, as diſtinguiſhed from *angel*, is evidently meant the departed ſpirit of a human being; for, that man is here, before his natural death, poſſeſſed of a vital and intelligent principle, which is commonly called his ſoul or ſpirit, it was never pretended that they denied. It has been ſaid, that this manner of expreſſing themſelves has been adopted by the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, merely in conformity to vulgar notions. To me it appears a conformity, which (if the ſacred writers

* Luke xvi. 22, 23. † Luke xxiii. 46. ‡ 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, 4. § Luke xxiv. 39. ‖ Acts xxiii. 8.

entertained the ſentiments of our antagoniſts on this article) is hardly reconcilable to the known ſimplicity and integrity of their character. It ſavours much more of the pious frauds, which became common afterwards, to which I own myſelf unwilling to aſcribe ſo ancient and ſo reſpectable an origin. See Part I. of this Diſſertation, § 10.

§ 24. I SHALL ſubjoin a few words on the manner wherein the diſtinction has been preſerved between *hades* and *gehenna* by the tranſlators of the New Teſtament; for, as I obſerved before, *gehenna*, as a name for the place of future puniſhment, does not occur in the Old. All the Latin tranſlations I have ſeen, obſerve the diſtinction. All without exception adopt the word *gehenna*, though they do not all uniformly tranſlate *hades*. Both the Geneva French, and Diodati, have followed the ſame method. Luther, on the contrary, in his German verſion, has uniformly confounded them, rendering both by the word **hölle**. The Engliſh tranſlators have taken the ſame method, and rendered both the Greek names by the word *hell*, except in one ſingle place * where ἀδης is tranſlated *grave*. Moſt foreign verſions obſerve the difference. So do ſome of the late Engliſh tranſlators, but not all. The common method of diſtinguiſhing, hitherto obſerved, has been to retain the word *gehenna*, and tranſlate *hades* either *hell* or *grave*, as appeared moſt to ſuit the context. I have choſen, in this verſion, to reverſe that method, to render γεεννα always *hell*, and to retain the word *hades*. My reaſons are, firſt, though Engliſh ears are not entirely familiarized to either term, they are much more ſo to the latter than to the former, in conſequence of the greater uſe made of the latter in theological writings. Secondly, the import of the Engliſh word *hell*, when we ſpeak as Chriſtians, anſwers exactly to γεεννα, not to ἀδης; whereas, to this laſt word we have no term in the language correſponding. Accordingly, though, in my judgment, it is not one of thoſe terms which admit different meanings, there has been very little uniformity preſerved by tranſlators in rendering it.

PART III.

Μετανοεω and Μεταμελομαι.

I SHALL now offer a few remarks on two words that are uniformly rendered by the ſame Engliſh word in the common verſion, between which there appears, notwithſtanding, to be a real difference in ſignification. The words are μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι, *I repent*. It has been obſerved, by ſome, and, I think, with reaſon, that the former denotes, properly, a change to the better; the latter, barely a change, whether it be to the better or to the worſe; that the former marks a change of mind that is durable and productive of conſequences; the latter expreſſes only a preſent uneaſy feeling of regret or ſorrow for what is done, without regard either to duration or to effects; in fine, that the firſt may properly be tranſlated into Engliſh, *to reform*; the ſecond, *to repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the word.

§ 2. THE learned Grotius (whoſe judgment, in critical queſtions, is highly reſpectable) is not convinced that this diſtinction is well founded. And I acknowledge that he advances ſome plauſible things in ſupport of his opinion. But as I have not found them ſatisfactory, I ſhall aſſign my reaſons for thinking differently. Let it, in the firſt place, be obſerved, that the import of μεταμελομαι, in the explanation given, being more extenſive or generical than that of μετανοεω, it may, in many caſes, be uſed, without impropriety, for μετανοεω; though the latter, being more limited and ſpecial in its acceptation, cannot ſo properly be employed for the former. The genus includes the ſpecies, not the ſpecies the genus.

§ 3. ADMITTING, therefore, that, in the expreſſion in the parable quoted by Grotius in ſupport of his opinion, ὑστερον δε μεταμεληθεις απηλθε, *afterwards he repented and went* †, the word μετανοησας would have been

 appoſite,

* 1 Cor. xv. 55.

† Matth. xxi. 29.

appoſite, becauſe the change ſpoken of is to the better, and had an effect on his conduct; ſtill the word μεταμελομαι is not improper, no more than the Engliſh word *repented*, though the change, as far as it went, was a real reformation. Every one who reforms, repents; but every one who repents does not reform. I uſe the words entirely according to the popular idiom, and not according to the definitions of theologians: nay, I ſay further, that in this inſtance the Greek word μεταμελομαι is more proper than μετανοεω, and the Engliſh *repent* than *reform* The reaſon is, becauſe the latter expreſſion in each language is not ſo well adapted to a ſingle action, as to a habit of acting, whereas the former may be equally applied to either. Now it is only one action that is mentioned in the parable.

§ 4. In regard to the other paſſage quoted by Grotius, to ſhow that μετανοια alſo is uſed where, according to the doctrine above explained, it ought to be μεταμελεια, I think he has not been more fortunate than in the former. The paſſage is, where it is ſaid of Eſau *, *Ye know that afterward, when he would have inherited the bleſſing, he was rejected. For he found no place of repentance,* μετανοιας τοπον ουχ ευρε, *though he ſought it carefully with tears.* Grotius, in his comment on the place, acknowledges that the word μετανοια is not uſed here literally, but by a metonomy of the effect for the cauſe. 'He found no ſcope for effecting a change in 'what had been done, a revocation of the bleſſing 'given to Jacob, with a new grant of it to himſelf, or 'at leaſt of ſuch a bleſſing as might, in a great meaſure, 'ſuperſede or cancel the former.' This change was what he found no poſſibility of effecting, however earneſtly and movingly he ſought it. It is plain, that neither μετανοια, nor μεταμελεια, in their ordinary acceptation, expreſſes this change. For that it was not any repentance or reformation on himſelf, which he found no place for, is manifeſt both from the paſſage itſelf, and from the ſtory to which it refers. From the conſtruction of the words we learn, that what Eſau did not find, was what he ſought carefully with tears. Now, what he ſought carefully with tears, was, as is evident from the hiſtory †, ſuch a change in his father as I have mentioned. This was what he urged ſo affectingly, and this was what he, notwithſtanding, found it impoſſible to obtain. Now I acknowledge that it is only by a trope that this can be called either μετανοια or μεταμελεια. That it was not literally the regret or grief implied in μεταμελεια that he ſought, is as clear as day, ſince the manner in which he applied to his father, ſhowed him to be already poſſeſſed of the moſt pungent grief for what had happened. Nay, it appears from the hiſtory, that the good old Patriarch, when he diſcovered the deceit that had been practiſed on him, was very ſtrongly affected alſo: for it is ſaid ‡, that Iſaac *trembled very exceedingly.* Now, as μετανοια implies a change of conduct, as well as ſorrow for what is paſt, it comes nearer the ſcope of the ſacred writer than μεταμελεια. If, therefore, there is ſome deviation from ſtrict propriety in the word μετανοια here uſed, it is unqueſtionable that to ſubſtitute in its place μεταμελεια, and repreſent Eſau as ſeeking, in the bitterneſs of grief, that he, or even his father, might be grieved, would include, not barely an impropriety, or deviation from the literal import, but an evident abſurdity.

§ 5. Passing theſe examples, which are all that have been produced on that ſide, are the words in general ſo promiſcuouſly uſed by ſacred writers (for it is only about words which ſeldom occur in Scripture, that we need recur to the uſage of profane authors), as that we cannot, with certainty, or at leaſt with probability, mark the difference? Though I do not believe this to be the caſe; yet, as I do not think the matter ſo clear as in the ſuppoſed ſynonymas already diſcuſſed, I ſhall impartially and briefly ſtate what appears to me of weight on both ſides.

§ 6. First, in regard to the uſage of the Seventy, it cannot be denied that they employ the two words indiſcriminately; and, if the preſent enquiry were about the uſe obſerved in their verſion, we could not, with juſtice, ſay, that they intended to mark any diſtinction between them. They are, beſides, uſed indifferently in tranſlating the ſame Hebrew words, ſo that there is every appearance that with them they were ſynonymous. But though the uſe of the Seventy adds conſiderable ſtrength to any argument drawn from the uſe of the New Teſtament writers, when the uſages of both are the ſame, or even doubtful; yet, when they differ, the former, however clear, cannot, in a queſtion which ſolely concerns the uſe that prevails in the New Teſtament, invalidate the evidence of the latter. We know, that in a much ſhorter period than that which intervened between the tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, and the compoſition of the New, ſome words may become obſolete, and others may conſiderably alter in ſignification. It is comparatively but a ſhort time (being leſs than two centuries) that has intervened between the making of our own verſion and the preſent hour; and yet, in regard to the language of that verſion, both have already happened, as ſhall be ſhown afterwards §. Several of its words are antiquated, and others bear a different meaning now from what they did then.

§ 7. Let

* Heb. xii. 17. † Gen. xxvii. 30, &c. ‡ Verſe 33. § Diſſ. XI. Part II. § 5, &c.

§ 7. LET us therefore recur to the uſe of the New Teſtament. And here I obſerve, firſt, that where this change of mind is inculcated as a duty, or the neceſſity of it mentioned as a doctrine of Chriſtianity, the terms are invariably μετανοεω and μετανοια. Thus John the Baptiſt and our Lord, both began their preaching with this injunction, μετανοειτε *. The diſciples that were ſent out to warn and prepare men for the manifeſtation of the Meſſiah, are ſaid to have gone and preached ινα μετανοησωσι †. The call which the Apoſtles gave to all hearers was, μετανοησατε, και επιστρεψατε, και βαπτισθητω ἑκαστος ὑμων ‡, *to reform their lives, return to God, and be baptiſed.* Peter's command to Simon Magus, on diſcovering the corruption of his heart, is μετανοησον απο της κακιας ταυτης §. When it is mentioned as an order from God, παραγγελλει τοις ανθρωποις πασι πανταχου μετανοειν ||. The duty to which Paul every where exhorted was, μετανοειν και επιστρεφειν επι τον Θεον ¶. The charge to reformation given to the Aſiatic churches in the Apocalypſe, is always expreſſed by the word μετανοησον, and their failure in this particular by ου μετενοησαν **. The neceſſity of this change for preventing final ruin, is thus repeatedly expreſſed by our Lord, Εαν μη μετανοητε, παντες απολεισθε ††. And, in regard to the noun, wherever mention is made of this change as a duty, it is μετανοια, not μεταμελεια. It was εις μετανοιαν that our Lord came to call ſinners ‡‡; the baptiſm which John preached was βαπτισμα μετανοιας §§. The fruits of a good life, which he enjoined them to produce, were αξιους μετανοιας ||||. What the Apoſtles preached to all nations, in their Maſter's name, as inſeparably connected, were μετανοιαν και αφεσιν αμαρτιων ¶¶. Again, it is given as the ſum of their teaching, την εις τον Θεον μετανοιαν, και πιστιν εις τον Κυριον ημων Ιησουν Χριστον ***. The ſame word is employed when the offer of ſuch terms is exhibited as the reſult of divine grace †††. Now, in a queſtion of criticiſm, it is hardly poſſible to find ſtronger evidence of the diſtinction than that which has now been produced.

§ 8. THERE is a great difference between the mention of any thing as a duty, eſpecially of that conſequence, that the promiſes or threats of religion depend on the performance or neglect of it; and the bare recording of an event as fact. In the former, the words ought to be as ſpecial as poſſible, that there may be no miſtake in the application of the promiſe, no pretence for ſaying that more is exacted than was expreſſed in the condition. But, in relating facts, it is often a matter of indifference, whether the terms be general or ſpecial. Provided nothing falſe be added, it is not expected that every thing true ſhould be included. This is the leſs neceſſary when, in the ſequel of a ſtory, circumſtances are mentioned, which ſupply any defect ariſing from the generality of the terms. Under this deſcription may be included both the paſſage formerly conſidered, υστερον μεταμεληθεις απηλθε; and that other connected with it, in the reproach pronounced againſt the Phariſees for their impenitence and incredulity under the Baptiſt's miniſtry, και μετεμεληθητε υστερον, του πιστευσαι αυτω ‡‡‡. The laſt clauſe in each perfectly aſcertains the import of the ſentence, and ſupplies every defect.

§ 9. LET it further be obſerved, that when ſuch a ſorrow is alluded to, as either was not productive of reformation, or, in the nature of the thing, does not imply it, the words μετανοια and μετανοεω are never uſed. Thus the repentance of Judas, which drove him to deſpair, is expreſſed by μεταμεληθεις §§§. When Paul, writing to the Corinthians, mentions the ſorrow his former letter had given them, he ſays, that, conſidering the good effects of that ſorrow, he does not repent that he had written it, though he had formerly repented. Here no more can be underſtood by his own repentance ſpoken of, but that uneaſineſs which a good man feels, not from the conſciouſneſs of having done wrong, but from a tenderneſs for others, and a fear, leſt that which, prompted by duty, he had ſaid, ſhould have too ſtrong an effect upon them. This might have been the caſe, without any fault in him, as the conſequence of a reproof depends much on the temper with which it is received. His words are, Ει ελυπησα υμας εν τη επιστολη ου μεταμελομαι ει και μετεμελομην ||||. As it would have made nonſenſe of the paſſage to have rendered the verb in Engliſh, *reformed* inſtead of *repented*, the verb μετανοεω inſtead of μεταμελομαι, would have been improper in Greek.

There is one paſſage in which this Apoſtle has in effect employed both words, and in ſuch a manner, as clearly ſhows the difference. Η κατα Θεον λυπη μετανοιαν εις σωτηριαν αμεταμελητον κατεργαζεται ¶¶¶: in the common verſion, *Godly ſorrow worketh repentance to ſalvation not to be repented of.* There is a paronomaſia here, or play upon the word *repent*, which is not in the original. As both words μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι are uniformly tranſlated by the ſame Engliſh word, this figure of ſpeech could hardly have been avoided in the common verſion. Now, had the two words been alſo ſynonymous in Greek (as that trope, when it comes in the way, is often adopted by the ſacred writers), it had been more natural to ſay μετανοιαν αμεταν[illegible]ητον. Whereas the change of the word plainly ſhows, that in the Apoſtle's judgment, there would have been ſomething

* Matth. iii. 2. iv. 17. † Mark vi 12. ‡ Acts ii. 38. iii. 19. § viii. 22. || xvii. 30.
¶ xxvi. 20. ** Rev. ii. and iii. paſſim. †† Luke xiii. 3. 5. ‡‡ Matth. ix. 13. §§ Mark i. 4.
||| Matth. iii. 8. ¶¶ Luke xxiv. 47. *** Acts xx. 21. ††† Acts xi. 18. ‡‡‡ Matth. xxi. [illegible].
§§§ Matth. xxvii. 3. |||| 2 Cor. vii. 8. ¶¶¶ Verſe. 10.

incongruous in that expreſſion. In the firſt word μετανοια, is expreſſed the effect of godly ſorrow, which is reformation, a duty required by our religion as neceſſary to ſalvation. In the other αμεταμελητον, there is no alluſion to a further reformation, but to a further change, it being only meant to ſay, that the reformation effected is ſuch as ſhall never be regretted, never repented of. As into the import of this word there enters no conſideration of goodneſs or badneſs, but barely of change, from whatever motive or cauſe; the word αμεταμελητος comes to ſignify *ſteady, immutable, irrevocable.* This is evidently the meaning of it in that expreſſion, Αμεταμελητα τα χαρισματα και η κλησις του Θεου*, which our tranſlators render, *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;* more appoſitely and perſpicuouſly, are *irrevocable.* For this reaſon the word μεταμελεομαι is uſed when the ſentence relates to the conſtancy or immutability of God. Thus Ωμοσε Κυριος και ου μεταμεληθησεται †: *The Lord hath ſworn and will not repent,* that is, *alter his purpoſe.*

The word αμετανοητον, on the contrary, including ſomewhat of the ſenſe of its primitive, expreſſes not, as the other, *unchanged* or *unchangeable,* but *unreformed, unreformable, impenitent.* The Apoſtle ſays, addreſſing himſelf to the obſtinate infidel, κατα την σκληροτητα σου και αμετανοητον καρδιαν ‡: *After thy hardneſs and impenitent,* or irreclaimable *heart.* The word αμεταμελητος, in the New Teſtament ſtyle, ought analogically to expreſs a wretched ſtate, as it ſignifies the want of that μετανοια, which the Goſpel every where repreſents as the indiſpenſible duty of the lapſed, and therefore as eſſential to their becoming Chriſtians: but the term αμεταμελητος is no way fitted to this end, as it expreſſes only the abſence of that μεταμελεια, which is nowhere repreſented as a virtue, or required as a duty, and which may be good, bad, or indifferent, according to its object. Thus I have ſhown, that on every pertinent occaſion, the diſtinction is ſacredly obſerved by the penmen of the New Teſtament, and that the very few inſtances in which it may appear otherwiſe at firſt glance, are found to be no exceptions when attentively examined.

§ 10. HAVING now aſcertained the diſtinction, it may be aſked, How the words ought to be diſcriminated in a tranſlation? In my opinion, μετανοεω, in moſt caſes, particularly where it is expreſſed as a command, or mentioned as a duty, ſhould be rendered by the Engliſh verb *reform,* μετανοια, by *reformation;* and that μεταμελεομαι ought to be tranſlated *repent.* Μεταμελεια is defined by Phavorinus δυσαρεσκησις επι πεπραγμενοις, *diſſatisfaction with one's ſelf, for what one has done,* which exactly hits the meaning of the word *repentance;* whereas μετανοια is defined γνησια απο πταισματων επι το κρειττον αγαθη επιστροφη, and η προς το κρειττον επιστροφη, *a genuine correction of faults,* and *a change from worſe to better.* We cannot more exactly define the word *reformation.* It may be ſaid that, in uſing the terms *repent* and *repentance,* as our tranſlators have done, for both the original terms, there is no riſk of any dangerous error; becauſe, in the theological definitions of repentance, given by almoſt all parties, ſuch a reformation of the diſpoſition is included, as will infallibly produce a reformation of conduct. This, however, does not ſatisfy. Our Lord and his Apoſtles accommodated themſelves in their ſtyle to the people whom they addreſſed, by employing words according to the received and vulgar idiom, and not according to the technical uſe of any learned doctors. It was not to ſuch that this doctrine was revealed, but to thoſe who, in reſpect of acquired knowledge, were babes §. The learned uſe is known comparatively but to a few: and it is certain that with us, according to the common acceptation of the words, a man may be ſaid juſt as properly to repent of a good, as of a bad, action. A covetous man will repent of the alms which a ſudden fit of pity may have induced him to beſtow. Beſides, it is but too evident, that a man may often juſtly be ſaid to repent, who never reforms. In neither of theſe ways do I find the word μετανοεω ever uſed.

I have another objection to the word *repent.* It unavoidably appears to lay the principal ſtreſs on the ſorrow or remorſe which it implies for former miſconduct. Now this appears a ſecondary matter at the moſt, and not to be the idea ſuggeſted by the Greek verb. The primary object is a real change of conduct. The Apoſtle expreſsly diſtinguiſhes it from ſorrow, in a paſſage lately quoted, repreſenting it as what the ſorrow, if of a godly ſort, terminates in, or produces. Η κατα Θεον λυπη μετανοιαν κατεργαζεται, rendered in the common verſion, *Godly ſorrow worketh repentance.* Now, if he did not mean to ſay that the thing was cauſed by itſelf, or that repentance (and who will charge him with this abſurdity?) η κατα Θεον λυπη is one thing, and μετανοια is another. But it is certain that our word repentance implies no more in common uſe, even in its beſt ſenſe, than η κατα Θεον λυπη, and often not ſo much. It is conſequently not a juſt interpretation of the Greek word μετανοια, which is not η κατα Θεον λυπη, but its certain conſequence. Grief or remorſe, compared with this, is but an accidental circumſtance. Who had more grief than Judas, whom it drove to deſpondency and ſelf-deſtruction? To him the Evangeliſt applies very properly the term μεταμεληθεις, which we as properly tranſlate *repented.* He was in the higheſt degree diſſatisfied with himſelf. But, to ſhow that a great deal more is neceſſary in the Chriſtian, neither our Lord himſelf, as we have ſeen,

* Rom. xi. 29. † Heb. vii. 21. ‡ Rom. ii. 5. § Matth. xi. 25.

ſeen, nor his forerunner John, nor his Apoſtles and miniſters who followed, ever expreſſed themſelves in this manner, when recommending to their hearers the great duties of Chriſtianity. They never called out to the people, μεταμελεισθε, but always μετανοειτε. If they were ſo attentive to this diſtinction, in order to prevent men, in ſo important an article, from placing their duty in a barren remorſe, however violent; we ought not ſurely to expreſs this capital precept of our religion, by a term that is juſt as well adapted to the caſe of Judas, as to that of Peter. For the Greek word μεταμελομαι, though carefully avoided by the inſpired writers, in expreſſing our duty, is fully equivalent to the Engliſh word *repent*.

§ 11. I SHALL now, ere I conclude this ſubject, conſider briefly in what manner ſome of the principal tranſlators have rendered the words in queſtion into other languages. I ſhall begin with the Syriac, being the moſt reſpectable, on the ſcore of antiquity, of all we are acquainted with. In this venerable verſion, which has ſerved as a model to interpreters in the Eaſt, in like manner as the Vulgate has ſerved to thoſe in the Weſt, the diſtinction is uniformly preſerved. Μετανοειν is rendered תוב *thub*, *to reform*, to return to God, to amend one's life; μετανοια תבותא *thebutha*, *reformation*; μεταμελεισθαι is rendered תוא *thua*, *to repent*, to be ſorry for what one has done. Nor are theſe Syriac words ever confounded as ſynonymous, except in the Apocalypſe, which, though now added in the printed editions, is in no part of that ancient tranſlation, but was made many centuries after.

The ſecond place in point of antiquity is, no doubt due to the Vulgate, where, I acknowledge, there is no diſtinction made. The uſual term for μετανοια is *pœnitentia*, for μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι indiſcriminately, *pœnitentiam ago*, *pœnitentiam habeo*, *pœnitèo*, or *me pœnitet*. Theſe can hardly be ſaid to expreſs more than the Engliſh words *repentance* and *repent*. Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον is not improperly rendered *pœnitentiam ſtabilem*, agreeably to an acceptation of the term above taken notice of.

Beza, one of the moſt noted, and by Proteſtants moſt imitated, of all the Latin tranſlators ſince the reformation, has carefully obſerved the diſtinction, wherever it was of conſequence; for, as I remarked, there are a few caſes in which either term might have been uſed in the original, and concerning which, a tranſlator muſt be directed by the idiom of the tongue in which he writes. The ſame diſtinction had been made before, though not with perfect uniformity, by the tranſlators of Zuric. Beza's word for μετανοεω is *reſipiſco*, and for μετανοια, *reſipiſcentia*. To this laſt term he was led both by analogy, and (if not by claſſical authority) by the authority of early eccleſiaſtical writers, which, in the tranſlation of holy writ, is authority ſufficient. Theſe words have this advantage of *pœnitere* and *pœnitentia*, that they always denote a change of ſome continuance, and a change to the better. For μεταμελομαι his word is *pœnitere*. Thus μεταμεληθεις, ſpoken of Judas, is *pœnitens*: Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον, *reſipiſcentiam cujus nunquam pœniteat*, in which the force of both words is very well expreſſed. So is alſo αμετανοητον καρδιαν, *cor quod reſipiſcere neſcit*. Eraſmus, one of the earlieſt tranſlators on the Romiſh ſide, uſes both *reſipiſco* and *pœnitentiam ago*, but with no diſcrimination. They are not only both employed in rendering the ſame word μετανοεω, but even when the ſcope is the ſame. Thus μετανοειτε in the imperative, is at one time *reſipiſcite*, at another *pœnitentiam agite*: ſo that his only view ſeems to have been to diverſify his ſtyle.

Caſtalio, one of the moſt eminent Latin Proteſtant tranſlators, has been ſenſible of the diſtinction, and careful to preſerve it in his verſion. But, as his great aim was to give a claſſical air to the books of Scripture, in order to engage readers of taſte who affected an elegant and copious diction; he has diſfigured, with his adventitious ornaments, the native ſimplicity which ſo remarkably diſtinguiſhes the ſacred penmen, and is, in fact, one of their greateſt ornaments. We can more eaſily bear ruſticity than affectation, eſpecially on the moſt ſerious and important ſubjects. Amongſt other arts, by which Caſtalio has endeavoured to recommend his work, one is a ſtudied variety in the phraſes, that the ear may not be tired by too frequent recurrence to the ſame ſounds. The words under conſideration afford a ſtrong example. The verb μετανοεω is tranſlated by him I know not how many different ways. It is *ſe corrigere*, *vitam corrigere*, *redire ad frugem*, *redire ad ſanitatem reverti ad ſanitatem*; when the vices which we are required to amend are mentioned, the phraſe is, *deſciſcere a ſua pravitate*, *deſiſtere a turpitudine*, *deſiſtere a ſuis operibus*, *impudicitia ſua recedere*, *ſua homicidia*, &c. *omittere*. Μετανοια partakes of the like variety. It is *emendata vita*, *vitæ emendatio*, *correcta vita*, *vitæ correctio*, *morum correctio*, *correcti mores*, *corrigenda vita*, *ſanitas*, *pœnitentia*; and in the oblique caſes, *frugem* and *bonam frugem*. For μεταμελομαι, I only find the two words *pœnitere* and *mutare ſententiam*. Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον is not badly rendered *vitæ correctionem nunquam pœnitendam*, αμεταμελητα χαρισματα *munera irrevocabilia*, and αμετανοητος καρδια, *deploratus animus*.

Diodati, the Italian tranſlator, in every caſe of moment, renders the verb μετανοεω *ravederſi*, which in the Vocabolario della Cruſca is explained *reſipiſcere*, *ad mentis ſanitatem redire*; but for the noun μετανοια, he always uſes *penitenza*, and for μεταμελομαι, very properly

perly *pentirsi*. The Geneva French, translates μετανοια, *s'amender*, μεταμελομαι, *se repentir*, and μετανοια, *repentance*. In both these versions they use, in rendering μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον, the same paronomasia which is in the common English version. Diodati has *penitenza della quale huom non si pente*. The Geneva French has *repentance dont on ne se repent*. The other passages, also above quoted from the original, they translate in nearly the same manner. Luther, in his German translation, has generally distinguished the two verbs, rendering μετανοειν **busse thun**, and μεταμελεσθαι **reuen gereuen**.

PART IV.

Ἅγιος *and* ὅσιος.

I SHALL give, as another example of words, supposed to be synonymous, the terms ἁγιος and ὁσιος. The former is, if I mistake not, uniformly rendered in the New Testament, *holy*, or, when used substantively in the plural, *saints*. The latter, except in one instance, is always rendered by the same term, not only in the English Bible, but in most modern translations. Yet that these two Greek words are altogether equivalent, there is, in my opinion, good reason to doubt. Both belong to the second class of words which I explained in a former Dissertation *. They relate to manners, and are therefore so not easily defined Nor are such words in one language ever found exactly to tally with those of another. There are, however, certain means, by which the true signification may, in most cases, be, very nearly, if not entirely, reached. I shall, therefore, first mention my reasons for thinking that the two words ἁγιος and ὁσιος in the New Testament are not synonymous, and then endeavour to ascertain the precise meaning of each.

§ 2. THAT there is a real difference in signification between the two Greek words, notwithstanding their affinity, my first reason for thinking is, because in the Septuagint, which is the foundation of the Hellenistic idiom, one of them is that by which one Hebrew word, and the other that by which another, not at all synonymous, is commonly translated. Ἁγιος is the word used for קדש *kadosh*, *sanctus*, *holy*, ὁσιος for חסיד *chasid*, *benignus*, *gracious*.

§ 3. MY second reason is, because these words have been understood by the ancient Greek translators to be so distinct in signification, that not in one single instance is the Hebrew word *kadosh* rendered by the Greek ὁσιος, or *chasid* by ἁγιος. What gives additional weight to this reason, is the consideration, that both words frequently occur; and that the Greek translators, though they have not been uniform in rendering either, but have adopted different words, on different occasions, for translating each; have, nevertheless, not in a single instance, adopted any of those terms for rendering one of these Hebrew words, which they had adopted for rendering the other. Few words occur oftener than *kadosh*. But, though it is, beyond comparison, oftenest translated ἁγιος, it is not so always. In one place it is rendered καθαρος, *mundus*, *clean*; the verb *kadash*, the etymon, is rendered δοξαζειν, *glorificare*, *to glorify*, καταβιβαζειν *ascendere facere*, *to cause to ascend*, καθαριζειν *purgare*, *to cleanse*, ἁγιαζειν *purificare*, *to purify*, as well as ἁγιαζειν and καθαγιαζειν *sanctificare*, *to hallow*, *to sanctify*; but not once by ὁσιος, or any of its conjugates. On the other hand, *chasid* is rendered ελεημων and πολυελεος *misericors*, *merciful*, ευλαβης *pius*, *devout*, and by some other words, but not once by ἁγιος, or by any of its conjugates, or by any of the terms employed in rendering *kadosh*; a certain sign, that to the old Greek translators, several other words appeared to have more coincidence with either, than these had with each other.

§ 4. The third reason, which inclines me to think that the two words are not synonymous, is because I find, on examining and comparing, that there is a considerable difference in the application of them, not only in the Old Testament, but in the New. In regard to

3

* Diss. II. §. 4.

to the word ἁγιος, it is applied not only to perſons, but to things inanimate, as the ſacred utenſils and veſtments; to times, as their jubilees and ſabbaths, their ſolemn feſtivals and faſts; and to places, as the land of Judea, the city of Jeruſalem, the mountain whereon ſtood the temple, the temple with its courts; but more eſpecially the houſe which the courts incloſed, the outer whereof was called, by way of eminence, ἡ ἁγια, *ſcilicet* σκηνη, *the holy place*, and the inner ἡ ἁγια ἁγιων, *the holy of holies*, or *the moſt holy place*. Now I find nothing like this in the uſe made of the word ὁσιος, which, as far as I can diſcover, is applied only to perſons, or beings ſuſceptible of character. The τα ὁσια Δαβιδ*, cannot be accounted an exception. The word uſed by the Prophet is חסד *cheſed*, *benignitas*, not חסיד *chaſid*, *benignus*, and is not improperly rendered in our verſion *mercies*. Nor is the ὁσιας χειρας of the Apoſtle†, an exception, this being manifeſtly not a literal, but a tropical uſe of the epithet, wherein that is applied to the inſtrument, which, in ſtrictneſs, is applicable only to the agent; as when we ſay a *ſlanderous tongue* and *guilty hands*, we are always underſtood as applying the qualities of *ſlander* and *guilt*, to the perſon of whoſe tongue and hands we are ſpeaking.

§ 5. I OBSERVE, further, that even when ἁγιος is applied to perſons, it has not always a relation to the moral character, but often to ſomething, which, in regard to the perſon, is merely circumſtantial and external. It is, in this reſpect, that the children of Iſrael are called a *holy* nation, being conſecrated by their circumciſion, notwithſtanding that they were a rebellious and ſtiff-necked people, and rather worſe, inſtead of better, than other nations; as their great legiſlator Moſes often declares to them. In this ſenſe the tribe of Levi was *holier* than any other tribe, purely becauſe ſelected for ſacred ſervice; the prieſthood had more *holineſs* than the other Levites, and the high-prieſt was the *holieſt* of all. There was the ſame gradation in theſe, as in the courts and houſe of the temple. It is in this ſenſe I underſtand the word ἁγιος, as applied to Aaron; *They envied Moſes, alſo in the camp, and Aaron the ſaint of the Lord*‡; τον ἁγιον Κυριου. Aaron's perſonal character does not ſeem to have entitled him to this diſtinction above Moſes, and the whole nation. Nor does the title ſeem to have been peculiarly applicable to him, in any other ſenſe than that now mentioned, namely, that he was the only one of the people who carried on his forehead the ſignature of his conſecration, *holineſs to the Lord*, ἁγιασμα Κυριου.

§ 6. ON the other hand, it does not appear, from any clear paſſage, either in the Old Teſtament or in the New, that the Hebrew *chaſid*, or the Greek *hoſios*, are ſuſceptible of this interpretation. I ſay, any clear paſſage; for I acknowledge there is one, the only one I can find in either, wherein the application of this term, as commonly underſtood, is ſimilar to that of the other lately quoted from the pſalms. It is in Moſes' benediction of the tribes, immediately before his death: *Of Levi he ſaid, Let thy Thummin and thy Urim be with thy holy one, whom thou didſt prove at Maſſah, and with whom thou didſt ſtrive at the waters of Meribah*§. Not to mention, that in the Samaritan copy of Pentateuch (which in ſome things is more correct than the Hebrew), there is a different reading of the word here rendered ὁσιος; the whole paſſage is exceedingly obſcure; inſomuch that it is impoſſible to ſay with certainty who is here called *chaſidecha*, which our tranſlators have rendered *thy holy one*. The words which follow ſerve rather to increaſe the darkneſs, than to remove it.

Houbigant, in his valuable edition of the Old Teſtament, with a new Latin tranſlation, and notes, will not admit that it can refer to Aaron or his ſucceſſors in the pontificate; and, in my judgment, ſupports his opinion with unanſwerable reaſons. One is that, the term *chaſid*, *hoſios*, is never applied to Aaron, nor to the prieſthood in general, nor to any prieſt as ſuch. Another is that, though we often hear of the people's proving God at Maſſah, and contending with him at the waters of Meribah, we no where hear that they proved or tempted Aaron, and ſtrove with him there. Indeed, if they had been ſaid to have tempted Moſes, the expreſſion though unuſual, had been leſs improper, becauſe the immediate recourſe of the people, in their ſtrait, was to Moſes. They chid with him, we told, and were almoſt ready to ſtone him ‖. Houbigant's opinion is, that by *thy holy one*, is here meant Jeſus Chriſt, who is diſtinguiſhed by this appellation in the book of Pſalms. *Thou wilt not ſuffer thy holy one*, חסידך *chaſidecha*, τον ὁσιον σου, *to ſee corruption* ¶. And to ſay that they ſtrove with, tempted or proved Chriſt in the wilderneſs, is conformable to the language of Scripture. *Neither let us tempt Chriſt*, ſays Paul**, *as ſome of them alſo tempted*, referring to what happened in the deſert, *and were deſtroyed of ſerpents*. Houbigant's verſion (the words being underſtood as addreſſed to Levi, according to the orignal, is *Levi autem dixit Thummin tuum, tuumque Urim viri, ſancti tui eſt, quem tu tentationis in loco tentaſti, cui convitium feciſti, apud aquas contradictionis*. It muſt be owned, that he has added ſome plauſibility to his gloſs upon the paſſage, by the turn he has given to the following verſes. But it is ſufficient for my purpoſe to ſay, in regard

* Iſaiah, lv. 3. Acts, xiii 34.
† Tim. ii. 8.
‡ Pſal. cvi 16.
§ Deut. xxxiii. 8.
‖ Exod. xvii. 1, &c. Numb. xx. 3, &c.
¶ Pſal. xvi. 10.
** 1 Cor. x. 9.

regard to the negative part of his remark, that he is certainly right in maintaining that the expreſſion does not refer to Aaron and his ſucceſſors. But as to the poſitive part, that it refers to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, will perhaps be thought more queſtionable. His being ſtyled *thy holy one*, τον ὁσιον σου, in words addreſſed to God, is not authority enough for underſtanding him to be meant by τω ὁσιω σου, *to thy holy one*, in words addreſſed to Levi.

§ 7. But to return: another difference in the application of the words ἁγιος and ὁσιος, is, the latter is ſometimes found coupled with other epithets expreſſive of different good qualities, and applied to character and moral conduct, each exhibiting as it were, a feature diſtinct from thoſe exhibited by the reſt. The word ἁγιος is not commonly accompanied with other epithets: when it is, they are of ſuch a general nature, as rather to affect the whole character than ſeparate parts of it. The author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews ſays of our Lord *, that he was ὁσιος, ακακος, αμιαντος, in the common tranſlation, *holy, harmleſs, undefiled*. But the Engliſh word *holy*, being general in its ſignification, adds nothing to the import of the other epithets, eſpecially of αμιαντος, and conſequently does not hit the exact meaning of the word ὁσιος, which here probably denotes *pious*; the two other epithets, being employed to expreſs compendiouſly the regards due to others, and to himſelf. Paul has given us another example in his character of a biſhop, who, he ſays †, ought to be φιλοξενον, φιλαγαθον, σωφρονα, δικαιον, ὁσιον ογκρατη. To render the word ὁσιος in this verſe *holy*, is chargeable with the ſame fault as in the former inſtance. The ſame thing holds alſo of the adverb ὁσιως. Now the word ἁγιος is not included in this manner, in an enumeration of good qualities. It is commonly found ſingle, or joined with other epithets equally general. The expreſſion uſed by the Apoſtle ‡, ὁ μεν νομος ἁγιος, και η εντολη ἁγια, και δικαια, και αγαθη: *The law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and juſt, and good*—is no exception; for we have no enumeration here of the virtues of an individual, but of the general good qualities that may be aſcribed to God's law. And though the terms are equally general, they are not ſynonymous; they preſent us with the different aſpects of the ſame object. To ſay that the law of God is *holy*, is to repreſent it as awful to creatures ſuch as we; to ſay it is *juſt*, is to remind us that it is obligatory; and to ſay it is *good*, is to tell us, in other words, that it is adapted to promote univerſal happineſs, and therefore *lovely*.

§ 8. Having aſſigned my reaſons for thinking that the two words ὁσιος and ἁγιος in the New Teſtament, are not ſynonymous, I ſhall now, as I propoſed, endeavour to aſcertain the preciſe meaning of each. I believe it will appear, on examination, that the affinity between the two Greek words, in their ordinary and claſſical acceptation, is greater than between the Hebrew words, in lieu of which they have been ſo generally ſubſtituted by the Seventy. This, which may have originated from ſome peculiarity in the idiom of Alexandria, has, I ſuppoſe, led the tranſlators of both Teſtaments to regard them often as equivalent, and to tranſlate them by the ſame word. The authors of the Vulgate in particular, have almoſt always employed *ſanctus* in expounding both. This has miſled moſt modern interpreters in the Weſt. As to our own tranſlators, the example has, doubtleſs, had ſome influence. Nevertheleſs they have in this not ſo implicitly followed the Vulgate in their verſion of the Old Teſtiment, as in that of the New. Let it be premiſed, that the ſignification of words in any nation do not remain invariably the ſame. In a courſe of years much fewer than two thouſand, which are reckoned to have elapſed from the commencement of the finiſhing of the ſacred canon, very conſiderable changes happen in the meanings of words in the ſame language, and among the ſame people. Now, to trace the gradations and nicer ſhades of meaning, which diſtinguiſh different periods, is one of the moſt difficult, but moſt important, taſks of criticiſm.

§ 9. In regard to the word *kadoſh*, *hagios*, I acknowledge that it does not ſeem to me to have had originally any relation to character or morals. Its primitive ſignification appears to have been *clean*; firſt, in the literal ſenſe, as denoting free from all filth, dirt, or naſtineſs; ſecondly, as expreſſing what, according to the religious ritual, was accounted *clean*. The firſt is natural, the ſecond ceremonial, cleanneſs. Some traces of the firſt of theſe meanings we have in the Old Teſtament, but nothing is more common there than the ſecond, particularly in the Pentateuch. Again, as things are made clean to prepare them for being uſed (and the more important the uſe, the more carefully they are cleaned) the term has been adopted to denote, thirdly, *prepared, fitted, deſtined for* a particular purpoſe, of what kind ſoever the purpoſe be; fourthly, and more eſpecially *conſecrated*, or devoted to a religious uſe; fifthly, as things, ſo prepared and devoted, are treated with peculiar care and attention, *to hallow* or *ſanctify*, comes to ſignify to honour, to reverence, to ſtand in awe of, and *holy* to imply worthy of this treatment, that is, honourable, *venerable*, awful: ſixthly, and laſtly, as outward and corporeal cleanneſs has, in all ages and languages been conſidered as an apt metaphor for moral purity, it denotes guiltleſs, *irreproachable*,

* Heb. vii. 26. † Tit. i. 8. ‡ Rom. vii. 12.

proachable, which is at preſent, among Chriſtians, the moſt common acceptation of the word.

§ 10. I SHALL give an example or two of each of the ſix uſes aforeſaid, not confining myſelf to the adjective *kadoſh*, but including its conjugates of the ſame root. Firſt, that it denotes *clean* in the vulgar acceptation, is manifeſt from the precept given to Iſrael in the deſart, to be careful to keep the camp free from all ordure *. The reaſon aſſigned is in theſe words: *For the Lord thy God walketh in the midſt of thy camp, therefore ſhall thy camp be holy*, והיה קדוש και ἐσαι ἁγια, *that he ſee no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee.*

Another remarkable example of this meaning we have in the hiſtory of king Hezekiah, who is ſaid to have given orders to the Levites †, to ſanctify the houſe of the Lord; the import of which order is explained by the words immediately following, and *carry forth the filthineſs out of the holy place.* The ſacred ſervice had, in the reign of the impious Ahaz, been for a long time totally neglected; the lamps were gone out, and the fire extinguiſhed on the altars, both of the burnt-offerings and of incenſe; nay, and the temple itſelf had at length been abſolutely deſerted and ſhut up. The king, intending to reſtore the religious worſhip of Jehovah to its former ſplendor, ſaw that the firſt thing neceſſary was to make clean the houſe, with all its furniture, that they might be fit for the ſervice. Frequent mention is made of this cleanſing in the chapter above referred to, where it is ſometimes called *cleanſing* ‡, ſometimes *ſanctifying* §; the Hebrew verbs טהר *tahar*, and קדש *kadaſh*, being manifeſtly, through the whole chapter, uſed indiſcriminately. Both words are, accordingly, in this paſſage, rendered by the Seventy indifferently ἁγιζειν and καθαριζειν, not ἁγιαζειν; in the Vulgate *mundare, expiare*, and once *ſanctificare.* In both the above examples the word *holy* is evidently the oppoſite of *dirty, naſty, filthy*, in the current acceptation of the terms. This, as being the ſimpleſt and moſt obvious, is probably the moſt primitive ſenſe. Things ſenſible firſt had names in every language. The names were afterwards extended to things conceivable and intellectual. This is according to the natural progreſs of knowledge.

§ 11. FROM this firſt ſignification, the tranſition is eaſy to that which, in the eye of the ceremonial law, is clean. One great purpoſe of that law, though neither the only nor the chief purpoſe, is to draw reſpect to the religious ſervice, by guarding againſt every thing that might favour of indecency or uncleanlineſs. The climate, as well as the nature of their ſervice, rendered this more neceſſary than we are apt to imagine. Any thing which could ſerve as a ſecurity againſt infectious diſorders in their public aſſemblies, whereof, as they lived in a hot climate, they were in much greater danger than we are, was a matter of the higheſt importance. Now, when once a fence is eſtabliſhed by ſtatute, it is neceſſary, in order to ſupport its authority, that the letter of the ſtatute ſhould be the rule in all caſes. Hence it will happen, that there may be a defilement in the eye of the law, where there is no natural foulneſs at all. This I call *ceremonial uncleanneſs*, to expreſs the reverſe of which, the term *holy* is frequently employed. Thus, by avoiding to eat what was accounted unclean food, they ſanctified themſelves ‖; they were likewiſe kept holy by avoiding the touch of dead bodies, to avoid which, was particularly required of the prieſts, except in certain caſes, they being obliged, by their miniſtry, to be holier than others ¶. Moſes is ſaid ** to ſanctify the people by making them waſh their clothes, and go through the legal ceremonies of purification. Nor is it poſſible to doubt that, when men were ordered to ſanctify themſelves directly for a particular occaſion, they were enjoined the immediate performance of ſomething which could be viſibly and quickly executed, and not the acquiſition of a character, which is certainly not the work of an hour or of a day. Thus the prieſts were to ſanctify themſelves, before they approached the Lord on Sinai; and thus the people were commanded by Joſhua to ſanctify themſelves in the evening, that they might be prepared for ſeeing the wonders which God was to perform among them next day ††. In the ſame ſenſe alſo Joſhua is ſaid to ſanctify the people ‡‡. In this ſenſe we are alſo to underſtand what we are told of thoſe who ſanctified themſelves for the obſervance of that great paſſover which Hezekiah cauſed to be celebrated. What is termed *ſanctifying* in one verſe, is *cleanſing* in another §§. To prevent being tedious, I do not repeat the whole paſſages, but refer to them in the margin; the reader may conſult them at his leiſure.

Even in the New Teſtament, where the word is not ſo frequently uſed in the ceremonial ſenſe, *holy* and *unclean*, ἁγιος and ακαθαρτος, are contraſted as natural oppoſites |||. In one place in the Old Teſtament ¶¶, the Seventy have rendered the word *kadoſh* καθαρος, as entirely equivalent, calling that pure or *clean* water, which, in Hebrew, is *holy water*; and oftner than once in the Targums or Chaldee paraphraſes, the Hebrew *kadoſh* is rendered, by their common term, for *clean.* Thus, in that paſſage of the Prophet ***, "Stand by thyſelf; come not near me, for I am *holier* "than thou," the laſt clauſe is in Chaldee, "I am *cleaner* than thou."

* See the whole paſſage, Deut. xxiii. 12, 13, 14. † 2 Chron. xxix. 5. &c. ‡ Verſe 15, 16. 18. § Verſe 5. 17. 19.
‖ Lev. xi. 42. &c. xx. 25, 26. ¶ Lev. xxi. 1—6. ** Exod. xix. 10, 14, 22. †† Joſh. iii. 5.
‡‡ Joſh. vii. 13. §§ 2 Chron. xxx. 17, 18. ||| 1 Cor. vii. 14. ¶¶ Numb. v. 17. *** Iſaiah lxv. 5.

§ 12. In regard to the third ſenſe, ſeparated or *prepared* for a ſpecial purpoſe, there are ſeveral examples. The appointing of places for cities of refuge, is, both in the original and in the Septuagint *, called ſanctifying them. To make ready for war is, in ſeveral places, to *ſanctify* for war †. In ſuch places, however, the Seventy have not imitated the Hebrew penmen, probably thinking it too great a ſtretch for the Greek language to employ ἁγιαζω in this manner. In one place, men are ſaid to be *ſanctified* for deſtruction ‡, that is, devoted or prepared for it. To devote to a bad, even to an idolatrous uſe, is called to ſanctify. Thus, both in Hebrew and in Greek, Micah's mother is ſaid § to *ſanctify* the ſilver which ſhe had devoted for making an idol, for her and her family to worſhip. From this application, probably, has ſprung ſuch anomalous productions as קדשה *kedeſhah*, *a proſtitute*, and קדשים *kedeſhim*, *Sodomites*. Nor is this ſo ſtrange as it may at firſt appear. Similar examples may be found in moſt tongues. The Latin *ſacer*, which commonly ſignifies *ſacred*, *holy*, *venerable*, ſometimes denotes the contrary, and is equivalent to *ſceleſtus*. *Auri ſacra fames*, the execrable thirſt of gold.

§ 13. The fourth meaning mentioned, was devoted to a religious or pious uſe. Thus Jeremiah was *ſanctified* ‖ from the womb, in being ordained a Prophet unto the nations; the Prieſts and the Levites were ſanctified or conſecrated for their reſpective ſacred offices. It were loſing time to produce examples of an uſe, ſo frequently to be met with in Scripture, and almoſt in every page of the Books of Moſes. In this ſenſe (for it admits degrees) the Jewiſh nation was called *holy*, they being conſecrated to God by circumciſion, the ſeal of his covenant; in this ſenſe alſo, all who profeſs Chriſtianity are denominated *ſaints*, having been dedicated to God in their baptiſm.

§ 14. Of the fifth meaning, according to which, to *hallow* or *ſanctify* denotes to reſpect, to honour, to venerate; and *holy* denotes reſpectable, honourable, venerable; we have many examples. Thus to *hallow* God, is oppoſed to profaning his name ¶, that is, to treating him with irreverence and diſreſpect. It is oppoſed alſo to the diſplay of a want of confidence in his power and in his promiſe **. It is in this meaning the word is uſed, when we are required to ſanctify the Sabbath, that is, to treat it with reſpect; and are commanded to pray that God's name may be hallowed, that is, honoured, revered. It is in this meaning chiefly that the word ſeems, in a lower degree, applied to angels, and, in the higheſt, to the Lord of heaven and earth.

There are ſome things which incline me to conclude, that this is more properly the import of the word, at leaſt in the application to God, than, as is commonly ſuppoſed, moral excellence in general. Doubtleſs, both the moral, and what are called the natural, attributes of God, may be conſidered as, in ſome reſpect, included, being the foundations of that profound reverence with which he ought ever to be mentioned, and more eſpecially addreſſed, by mortals. But it is worthy of our notice, that when the term *holy* is applied to God, and accompanied with other attributives, they are ſuch as infuſe fear rather than love, and ſuggeſt ideas of vengeance rather than of grace. When Joſhua found it neceſſary to alarm the fears of an inconſiderate nation, he told them, *Ye cannot ſerve the Lord, for he is a holy God, he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your tranſgreſſions and ſins* ††. Again, this epithet *holy* is more frequently than any other applied to God's name. Now, if we conſider what other epithets are thus applied in Scripture, we ſhall find that they are not thoſe which expreſs any natural or moral qualities abſtractly conſidered; they are not the names of eſſential attributes, but ſuch only as ſuggeſt the ſentiments of awe and reverence with which he ought to be regarded by every reaſonable creature. No mention is made of God's wiſe name, powerful name, or true name, good name, or merciful name, faithful name, or righteous name; yet all theſe qualities, wiſdom, power, truth, goodneſs, mercy, faithfulneſs, and righteouſneſs, are, in numberleſs inſtances, aſcribed to God, as the eternal and immutable perfections of his nature: but there is mention of his fearful name, his glorious name, his great name, his reverend name, and his excellent name, ſometimes even of his dreadful name, but oftenеſt of his holy name; for all theſe terms are comparative, and bear an immediate reference to the ſentiments of the humble worſhipper. Nay, as the epithet *holy* is often found in conjunction with ſome of the others above mentioned, which admit this application, they ſerve to explain it. Thus the Pſalmiſt ‡‡, *Let them praiſe thy great and terrible name; for it is holy.* Again §§, *Holy and reverend is his name.*

What was the diſplay which Jehovah made to the Philiſtines, when his ark was in their poſſeſſion, a diſplay which extorted from them the acknowledgment that the God of Iſrael is a holy God before whom they could not ſtand? It was ſolely of ſovereignty and uncontroulable power in the deſtruction of their idol god Dagon, and great numbers of the people. This filled them with ſuch terror at the bare ſight of the ark, the ſymbol of God's preſence, as was too much for them to bear. And indeed both the Greek ἁγιος, and the Latin *ſanctus*, admit the ſame meaning, and are often equivalent to *auguſtus*, *venerandus*. The former term *auguſtus*, Caſtalio has frequently, and not improperly, adopted in his verſion, when the Hebrew word *kadoſh* is

* Joſh. xx. 7. † Jer. vi. 4. Mic. iii. 5. ‡ Jer. xii. 3. § Judg. xvii. 3. ‖ Jer. i. 5.
¶ Lev. xxii. 32. ** Numb. xx. 12. †† Joſhua xxiv. 19. ‡‡ Pſal. xcix. 3. §§ Pſal. cxi. 9.

is applied to God. The change of the epithet *ſanctus* is not neceſſary; but if perſpicuity might be thought in a particular caſe to require it, I ſhould prefer the latter term *venerandus*, as more expreſſive of religious awe. Further, when the term *holy* is aſcribed by angels to God, we find it accompanied with ſuch words or geſtures as are expreſſive of the profoundeſt awe and veneration.

The deſcription, action, and exclamation of the ſeraphim in Iſaiah *, lead our thoughts more to the ideas of majeſty and tranſcendent glory than to thoſe of a moral nature. *I ſaw the Lord ſitting upon a throne, high and lofty, and his train filled the temple: above it ſtood the ſeraphim: each one had ſix wings: with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried to another, and ſaid, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah the God of hoſts, the whole earth is full of his glory. And the pillars of the porch were ſhaken by the voice of him that cried; and the houſe was filled with ſmoke.* Every thing in this diſcription is awful and majeſtic. That he is the Lord of hoſts who dwelleth on high, in whoſe auguſt preſence even the ſeraphim muſt veil their faces, and that the whole earth is full of his glory, are introduced as the ground of aſcribing to him thrice in the moſt ſolemn manner the epithet *holy*.

There is a paſſage pretty ſimilar to this in the Apocalypſe †. *The four beaſts* (or, as the word ought to be rendered, *living creatures*), *had each of them ſix wings about him, and they were full of eyes within; and they reſt not day and night, ſaying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty, who was, and is, and is to come. And when thoſe creatures give glory, and honour, and thanks, to him that ſitteth on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever; the four and twenty elders fall down before him that ſitteth on the throne, and worſhip him that liveth for ever and ever, and caſt their crowns before the throne, ſaying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou haſt created all things, and for thy pleaſure they are, and they were created.* Here every circumſtance points to the majeſty, power, and dominion, not to the moral perfections of God; the action and doxology of the elders make the beſt comment on the exclamation of the four living creatures, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty, &c.

It is univerſally admitted, that to hallow or ſanctify the name of God, is to venerate, to *honour* it. According to analogy, therefore, to affirm that the name of God is holy, is to affirm that it is *honourable*, that it is *venerable*. Nay, in the ſame ſenſe, we are ſaid to ſanctify God himſelf; that is, to make him the object of our veneration and awe. In this way to ſanctify God, is nearly the ſame as to fear him, differing chiefly in degree, and may be oppoſed to an undue fear of man. Thus it is employed by the Prophet ‡, *Say not, A confederacy to all them to whom this people ſhall ſay, a confederacy, neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hoſts himſelf, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.* But nothing can give a more appoſite example of this uſe than the words of Moſes to Aaron §, on the occaſion of the terrible fate of Aaron's two ſons, Nadab and Abihu. *This is that the Lord ſpake, I will be ſanctified in them that come nigh me; and before all the people I will be glorified.* Their tranſgreſſion was, that *they offered before the Lord ſtrange fire*, or what was not the peculiar fire of the altar, lighted originally from heaven, but ordinary fire kindled upon their own hearths, an action which, in the eye of that diſpenſation, muſt be deemed the groſſeſt indignity. Spencer || has well expreſſed the ſenſe of the paſſage in theſe words: "Deum ſanctum eſſe, id eſt, a quavis perſona vel emi- "nentia, incomparabili naturæ ſuæ excellentia, ſepera- "tum, ideoque poſtulare, ut ſanctificetur, id eſt, au- "guſtè decorè, et ritu naturæ ſuæ ſeparatæ, imaginem "quandam ferente, colatur."

§ 15. The ſixth and laſt ſenſe mentioned, was *moral purity* and innocence, a ſenſe which, by a very natural turn of thinking, ariſes out of the two firſt meanings aſſigned, namely, clean in the common import of the word, and clean in the eye of the ceremonial law. This meaning might, in reſpect of its connection with theſe, have been ranked in the third place. But, becauſe I conſider this as originally a metaphorical uſe of the word, and requiring a greater degree of refinement than the other meanings, I have reſerved it for the laſt. This acceptation is accordingly much more frequent in the New Teſtament than in the Old. In the latter, it oftner occurs in the prophetical and devotional writings, than in the Pentateuch, and the other hiſtorical books, where we never find *holy* mentioned in the deſcription of a good character. This, in my judgment, merits a more particular attention than ſeems to have been given it. In what is affirmed expreſsly in commendation of Noah, Abraham, or any of the Patriarchs, of Moſes, Joſhua, Job, David, Hezekiah, or any of the good kings of Iſrael or Judah, or any of the Prophets or ancient worthies, except where there is an alluſion to a ſacred office, the term *kadoſh*, holy, is not once employed. Now, there is hardly another general term, as *juſt*, *good*, *perfect*, *upright*, whereof, in ſuch caſes, we do not find examples. Yet there is no epithet which occurs oftner on other occaſions than that whereof I am ſpeaking. But in the time of the Evangeliſts, this moral application of the correſponding word *hagios*, was become more familiar; though the other meanings were not obſolete, as they are almoſt all at preſent. Herod is ſaid to

* Iſaiah vi. 1, &c. † Rev. iv. 8, &c. ‡ Iſaiah viii. 12, 13. § Lev. x. 1, &c. || Lib. I. cap. vii.

have known that John the Baptiſt *was a juſt man and a holy* *. There is nothing like this in all the Old Teſtament. When David pleads that he is *holy* †, it is not the word *kadoſh* that he uſes. The many injuctions to holineſs given in the law, as has been already hinted, have at leaſt a much greater reference to ceremonial purity than to moral. The only immorality, againſt which they ſometimes ſeem immediately pointed, is *idolatry*, it being always conſidered in the law as the greateſt degree of defilement in both ſenſes, ceremonial and moral.

But as every vicious action is a tranſgreſſion of the law, holineſs came gradually to be oppoſed to vice of every kind. The conſideration of this, as a ſtain on the character, as what ſullies the mind, and renders it ſimilarly diſagreeable to a virtuous man, as dirt renders the body to a cleanly man, has been common in moſt nations. Metaphors, drawn hence, are to be found, perhaps, in every language. As the ideas of a people become more ſpiritual and refined, and, which is a natural conſequence, as ceremonies ſink in their eſtimation, and virtue riſes, the ſecondary and metaphorical uſe of ſuch terms grows more habitual, and often in the end ſupplants the primitive and the proper. This has happened to the term *holineſs*, as now commonly underſtood by Chriſtians, or rather to the original terms ſo rendered. It had, in a good meaſure, happened, but not entirely, in the language of the Jews, in the days of our Lord and his Apoſtles. The exhortations to holineſs in the New Teſtament, are evidently to be underſtood of moral purity, and of that only. On other occaſions, the words *holy* and *ſaints*, ἅγιοι, even in the New Teſtament, ought to be explained in conformity to the fourth meaning above aſſigned, devoted or conſecrated to the ſervice of God.

§ 16. HAVING illuſtrated theſe different ſenſes, I ſhall conſider an objection that may be offered againſt the interpretation here given of the word *holy*, when applied to God, as denoting *awful, venerable*. Is not, it may be ſaid, the imitation of God, in holineſs, enjoined as a duty? And does not this imply, that the thing itſelf muſt be the ſame in nature, how different ſoever in degree, when aſcribed to God, and when enjoined on us? As I did not entirely exclude this ſenſe, to wit, *moral purity*, from the term, when applied to the Deity, I readily admit that, in this injunction in the New Teſtament, there may be a particular reference to it. But it is not neceſſary that, in ſuch ſentences, there be ſo perfect a coincidence of ſignification, as ſeems in the objection to be contended for. The words are, *Be ye holy, for* (not *as*) *I am holy*. In the paſſage where this precept firſt occurs, it is manifeſt, from the context, that the ſcope of the charge given to the people, is to avoid ceremonial impurities; thoſe particularly that may be contracted by eating unclean meats, and above all, by eating inſects and reptiles, which are called an abomination. Now, certainly, in this inferior acceptation, the term is utterly inapplicable to God. But what entirely removes the difficulty, is, that the people are ſaid, by a participation in ſuch unclean food, to make themſelves abominable. To this the precept, *Sanctify yourſelves, and be ye holy*, ſtands in direct oppoſition. There is here, therefore, a coincidence of the ſecond and fifth meanings of the word *holy*, which are connected, in their application to men, as the means and the end, and therefore ought both to be underſtood as comprehended; though the latter alone is applicable to God, Now, as the oppoſite of abominable is *eſtimable, venerable*, the import of the precept, *Sanctify yourſelves*, manifeſtly is, 'Be careful, by a ſtrict attention to the ſta-'tutes ye have received concerning purity, eſpecially 'in what regards your food, to avoid the pollution 'of your body; maintain thus a proper reſpect for 'your perſons, that your religious ſervices may be 'eſteemed by men, and accepted of God; for re-'member that the God whom ye ſerve, as being pure 'and perfect, is entitled to the higheſt eſteem and ve-'neration. Whatever, therefore, may be called *ſlovenly*, 'or what his law has pronounced impure in his ſer-'vants, is an indignity offered by them to their maſter, 'which he will certainly reſent.'

But as an artful gloſs or paraphraſe will ſometimes miſlead, I ſhall ſubjoin the plain words of Scripture ‡, which come in the concluſion of a long chapter, wherein the laws relating to cleanneſs in animal food, in beaſts, birds, fiſhes, and reptiles, are laid down. *Whatſoever goeth upon the belly, and whatſoever goeth upon all four, or whatſoever hath more feet among all creeping things, that creep upon the earth; them ye ſhall not eat, for they are an abomination. Ye ſhall not make yourſelves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither ſhall ye make yourſelves unclean with them, that ye ſhould be defiled thereby. For I am the Lord your God; ye ſhall therefore ſanctify yourſelves, and ye ſhall be holy; for I am holy: neither ſhall ye defile yourſelves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; ye ſhall therefore be holy, for I am holy.* It is plain that, any other interpretation of the word *holy* than that now given, would render the whole paſſage incoherent.

§ 17. Now, to come to the word חסיד *chaſid*, ὅσιος, this is a term which properly and originally expreſſes a mental quality, and that only in the ſame manner as

* Mark vi. 20. † Pſal. lxxxvi. 2. ‡ Lev. xi. 42, &c.

as צדיק *tſaddik*, δικαιος *juſt*, אמון *amon*, πιστος *faithful*, and ſeveral others. Nor is there any material variation of meaning that the word ſeems to have undergone at different periods. The moſt common acceptation is *gracious*, *merciful*, *beneficent*, *benign*. When there appears to be a particular reference to the way wherein the perſon ſtands affected to God and religion, it means *pious*, *devout*. In conformity to this ſenſe, our tranſlators have, in ſeveral places in the Old Teſtament, rendered it *godly*. The phraſe οι οσιοι του Θεου, is therefore, not improperly rendered *the ſaints of God*, that is, his pious ſervants. It moſt probably, as was hinted before, means *pious* in what is ſaid of our Lord, that he was οσιος, ακακος, αμιαντος, as it ſeems to have been the intention of the ſacred writer to comprehend, in few words, his whole moral character reſpecting God, the reſt of mankind, and himſelf. In the enumeration which Paul gives to Titus *, of the virtues whereof a biſhop ought to be poſſeſſed, it is ſurely improper to explain any of them by a general term equally adapted to them all; ſince nothing can be plainer than that his intention is to denote, by every epithet, ſome quality not expreſſed before. His words are φιλοξενον, φιλαγαθον, σωφρονα, δικαιον, οσιον, εγκρατη. To render οσιον *holy* (though that were in other places a proper verſion) would be here in effect the ſame as to omit it altogether. If the ſenſe had been *pious*, it had probably been either the firſt or the laſt in the catalogue. As it ſtands, I think, it ought to be rendered *beneficent*.

There are certain words which, on ſome occaſions, are uſed with greater, and on others, with leſs, latitude. Thus the word δικαιος ſometimes comprehends the whole of our duty to God, our neighbour, and ourſelves; ſometimes it includes only the virtue of juſtice. When οι δικαιοι is oppoſed to οι πονηροι, the former is the caſe, and it is better to render it *the righteous*, and δικαιοσυνη *righteouſneſs*; but when δικαιος or δικαιοσυνη occur in a liſt with other virtues, it is better to render them *juſt* or *juſtice*. Sometimes the word is employed in a ſenſe which has been called forenſic, as being derived from judicial proceedings. *He that juſtifieth the wicked*, ſays Solomon †, *and he that condemneth the juſt, even they both are abomination to the Lord*. The word *wicked*, means here no more than *guilty*, and the word *juſt*, guiltleſs of the crime charged. In like manner οσιοτης, in one or two inſtances, may be found in the New Teſtament, in an extent of ſignification greater than uſual. In ſuch caſes it may be rendered *ſanctity*, a word rather more expreſſive of what concerns manners than *holineſs* is.

§ 18. BUT, as a further evidence that the Hebrew word חסיד *chaſid*, is not ſynonymous with קדוש *kadoſh*, and conſequently neither οσιος with αγιος, it muſt be obſerved, that the abſtract חסד *cheſed*, is not once rendered by the Seventy οσιοτης, or, by our interpreters, *holineſs*, though the concrete is almoſt always rendered οσιος in Greek, and often *holy* in Engliſh. This ſubſtantive, on the contrary, is tranſlated in the Septuagint, ελεος, ελεημοσυνη, οικτειρημα, ελπις, χαρις, or ſome ſuch term; once, indeed, and but once, οσια. In Engliſh it is tranſlated *kindneſs*, *favour*, *grace*, *mercy*, *loving-kindneſs*, *pity*, but never *holineſs*. The analogy of language (unleſs uſe were clear againſt it, which is not the caſe here) would lead us to think, that there muſt be a nearer relation in meaning than this, between the ſubſtantive and the adjective formed from it. Yet *worthy* does not more evidently ſpring from *worth*, than חסיד *chaſid*, ſprings from חסד *cheſed*. Of the term laſt mentioned it may be proper juſt to obſerve, that there is alſo an anomalous uſe (like that remarked in *kadoſh*), which aſſigns it a meaning, the reverſe of its uſual ſignification, anſwering to ανομια, ονειδος, *flagitium*, *probrum*. But it is only in two or three places that the word occurs in this acceptation.

§ 19. I SHALL conclude with obſerving, that *chaſid* or *hoſios* are ſometimes applied to God; in which caſe there can be little doubt of its implying *merciful*, *bountiful*, *gracious*, *liberal*, or *benign*. The only caſe, wherein it has an affinity in meaning to the Engliſh word *ſaint* or *holy*, is when it expreſſes pious affections towards God. As theſe cannot be attributed to God himſelf, the term, when uſed of him, ought to be underſtood, according to its moſt frequent acceptation. The Pſalmiſt's words, which, in the common verſion, are ‡, *The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy*, chaſid, *in all his works*, would have been more truly, as well as intelligibly and emphatically rendered, *The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and bountiful in all his works*. There is not equal reaſon for tranſlating in the ſame manner the Greek *hoſios*, when applied to God in the New Teſtament. Though *hoſios*, in the Septuagint, commonly occupies the place of *chaſid*, it does not always. It is ſometimes employed in tranſlating the Hebrew words תם *tham*, *perfect*, and ישר *jaſher*, *upright*. Once it is uſed for this laſt term when applied to God §. Theſe words, therefore, οτι μονος οσιος ||, in an addreſs to God, ought to be tranſlated, *for thou alone art perfect*, rather than *bountiful* or *gracious*. The addition of μονος to the other epithet, is a ſufficient ground for this preference. The context alſo favours it. But, in the more common acceptation of the term οσιος *hoſios*, there is this difference between it and αγιος *hagios*, as applied to God, that the latter appellation repreſents the Deity as awful, or rather terrible; the former as amiable. The

* Titus i. 8. † Prov. xvii. 15. ‡ Pſal. cxlv. 17. § Deut. xxxii. 4. || Rev. xv. 4.

The latter checks all advances on our part. We are ready to cry with the men of Bethſhemeſh *, *Who is able to ſtand before this holy God?* The former emboldens us to approach. Thus they are ſo far from being ſynonymous in this application, that they may rather be contraſted with each other. As to their import, when applied to men, the word ἁγιος, in the beſt ſenſe, ſtill retains ſo much of its origin, as to appear rather a negative character, denoting a mind without ſtain; whereas the term ὁσιος is properly poſitive, and implies, in its utmoſt extent, both piety and benevolence.

§ 20. In regard to the manner of tranſlating *kadoſh* in the Old Teſtament, and *hagios* in the New; when all circumſtances are conſidered, I think it ſafeſt to retain very generally the common verſion *holy*. The ſame remark holds nearly alſo of the conjugates. It is very true that the ſenſe of the original in many places does entirely ſuit the meaning, which we affix to that word. But it is certain, on the other hand, that we have no one word that anſwers ſo well in all caſes. To change the term with each variation in meaning, would be attended with great inconveniency: and, in many caſes, oblige the tranſlator to expreſs himſelf either unintelligibly, and, to appearance, inconſequentially, or too much in the manner of the paraphraſt. On the other hand, as the Engliſh term *holy* is ſomewhat indefinite in reſpect of meaning, and in a manner appropriated to religious ſubjects, nothing can ſerve better to aſcertain and illuſtrate the ſcriptural uſe than ſuch uniformity; and the ſcriptural uſe of a word hardly current in common diſcourſe, cannot fail to fix the general acceptation. But this would not hold of any words in familiar uſe on ordinary ſubjects. With regard to ſuch, any deviation from the received meaning would, to common readers, prove the occaſion of perplexity at leaſt, if not of error. But *chaſid* in the Old Teſtament, and *hoſios* in the New (except when uſed ſubſtantively, where it may be rendered *ſaint*), ought, when it reſpects the diſpoſition towards God, to be tranſlated *pious*; when it reſpects the diſpoſition towards men, *gracious*, *kind*, *humane*.

PART V.

Κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, and διδασκειν.

THE only other ſpecimen I ſhall here give of words ſuppoſed to be ſynonymous, or nearly ſo, ſhall be κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, and διδασκειν, all nearly related, the former three being almoſt always rendered in Engliſh *to preach*, and the laſt *to teach*. My intention is, not only to point out exactly the differences of meaning in theſe words, but to evince that the words whereby the two former are rendered in ſome, perhaps moſt, modern languages, do not entirely reach the meaning of the original terms; and, in ſome meaſure, by conſequence, miſlead moſt readers. It happens in a tract of ages through the gradual alterations which take place in reſpect of laws, manners, rites, and cuſtoms, that words come, as it were, along with theſe, by imperceptible degrees, to vary conſiderably from their primitive ſignification. Perhaps it is oftner than we are aware, to be aſcribed to this cauſe, that the terms employed by tranſlators, are found ſo feebly to expreſs the meaning of the original.

§ 2. The firſt of the words above mentioned, κηρυσσειν, rendered *to preach*, is derived from κηρυξ, rendered *a preacher*, whence alſo κηρυγμα, rendered *a preaching*. The primitive κηρυξ ſignifies properly both *herald* and *common crier*, and anſwers exactly to the Latin word *caduceator* in the firſt of theſe ſenſes, and to *præco* in the ſecond. The verb κηρυσσειν is accordingly *to cry*, *publiſh*, or *proclaim* authoritatively, or by commiſſion from another, and the noun κηρυγμα is *the thing publiſhed* or *proclaimed*. The word κηρυξ occurs only twice in the Septuagint, and once in the apocryphal book Eccleſiaſticus, and evidently means in them all *crier*. The other ſenſe of the word, namely, *herald* or meſſenger of important intelligence between princes and ſtates, is nearly related, as the ſame perſons had often the charge of carrying ſuch embaſies, and of proclaiming war or peace: but it is not quite the ſame. In the New Teſtament the word ſeems to partake of both ſenſes, but more evidently of that of *crier*. And to this ſenſe the derivatives κηρυσσω and κηρυγμα, more properly accord than to the other: for, to diſcharge the office of herald is, in Greek, κηρυκευειν, and the office

* 1 Sam. vi. 20.

office itſelf κηρυκευσις. But theſe words, though frequent in claſſical writers, are not found in Scripture. The word κηρυξ occurs but thrice in the New Teſtament, once in each of the Epiſtles to Timothy *, wherein Paul calls himſelf κηρυξ και αποστολος; and once it is uſed by the Apoſtle Peter, who, ſpeaking of Noah, calls him † κηρυξ δικαιοσυνης. The word κηρυγμα occurs but in three places in the Septuagint, and imports in them all *proclamation* or *thing proclaimed*. In one of thoſe places it relates to that made by the Prophet Jonah, through the ſtreets of Nineveh, called, as in the Goſpel, *preaching* ‡, and in another§, is, in the common verſion, rendered *proclamation*. In the New Teſtament it occurs eight times, and is always rendered *preaching*. In two of thoſe places it relates to Jonah's proclamation in Nineveh. The verb κηρυσσω occurs in the New Teſtament about five and twenty times, always in nearly the ſame ſenſe: *I proclaim, prædico palam annuncio.* In at leaſt twelve of theſe caſes it relates ſolely to proclamations made by human authority, and denotes in them all *to warn*, or, by crying out, to advertiſe people openly of any thing done or to be done, or danger to be avoided. This may be called the primitive ſenſe of the word, and in this it will be found to be oftener employed in the New Teſtament.

§ 3. Now, if it be aſked, whether this ſuits the import of the Engliſh word, *to preach*, by which it is almoſt always rendered in the common verſion of this part of the canon, I anſwer, that, in my judgment, it does not entirely ſuit it. *To preach*, is defined, by Johnſon, in his Dictionary, "to pronounce a public "diſcourſe upon ſacred ſubjects." This expreſſes, with ſufficient exactneſs, the idea we commonly affix to the term. For, we may admit, that the attendant circumſtances of church, pulpit, text, worſhip, are but appendages. But the definition, given by the Engliſh lexicographer, cannot be called an interpretation of the term κηρυσσω, as uſed in Scripture. For, ſo far is it from being neceſſary that the κηρυγμα ſhould be a diſcourſe, that it may be only a ſingle ſentence, and a very ſhort ſentence too. Nay, to ſuch brief notification we ſhall find the term moſt frequently applied. Beſides, the word κηρυσσω, and κηρυγμα, were adopted, with equal propriety, whether the ſubject were ſacred or civil. Again, though the verb κηρυσσω always implied public notice of ſome event, either accompliſhed, or about to be accompliſhed, often accompanied with a warning, to do or forbear ſomething; it never denoted either a comment on, or explanation of, any doctrine, critical obſervations on, or illuſtrations of, any ſubject, or a chain of reaſoning, in proof of a particular ſentiment. And, if ſo, to pronounce publicly ſuch a diſcourſe, as, with us, is denominated ſermon, homily, lecture, to preaching, would, by no means, come within the meaning of the word κηρυσσω, in its firſt and moſt common acceptation. It is, therefore, not ſo nearly ſynonymous with διδασκω, *to teach*, as is now commonly imagined.

§ 4. But, that we may be more fully ſatisfied of this, it will be neceſſary to examine more cloſely the application of the world in the Goſpels, and in the Acts. The firſt time it occurs, is in the account that is given of our Lord's harbinger ‖. *In thoſe days came John the Baptiſt,* κηρυσσων εν τη ερημω της Ιουδαιας, και λεγων, *making proclamation in the wilderneſs of Judea, and ſaying.* Now, what was it that he cried, or proclaimed in the wilderneſs? It immediately follows, Μετανοειτε ηγγικε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων. *Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.* This is, literally, his κηρυγμα, proclamation, or preaching, ſtript of allegorical language in which it is clothed by the prophet¶, as quoted in the next verſe to this effect: *For this is he to whom Iſaiah alludeth in theſe words, The cry of a crier in the deſart,* "*Prepare a way for the Lord, make* "*his road ſtraight.*" Hence we may learn, what the Evangeliſts call βαπτισμα μετανοιας, which John preached for the remiſſion of ſins. He proclaimed to all within hearing, that if they would obtain the pardon of former offences, they muſt now enter on a new life; for that the reign of the Meſſiah was juſt about to commence; and, as a pledge of their intended reformation, and an engagement to it, he called on all to come and be baptized by him, confeſſing their ſins.

Another public intimation, which John made to the people, and to which the word κηρυσσω is alſo applied, we have in Mark **: *He proclaimed, ſaying,* "*After me cometh one mightier than I, whoſe ſhoe latchet* "*I am not worthy to ſtoop down and untie. I indeed bap-*"*tiſe you in water, but he will baptiſe you in the Holy* "*Spirit.*" Such ſhort calls, warnings, notices, or advertiſements, given with a loud voice to the multitude, from whomſoever, and on what ſubject ſoever, come under the notion of κηρυγματα, as uſed in Scripture. To the particular moral inſtructions which John gave the people ſeverally, according to their different profeſſions, the word κηρυσσω is not applied, but παρακαλεω, *to admoniſh, to exhort* ††. Πολλα μεν ουν και ετερα παρακαλων ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον. Which is very improperly tranſlated, *And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.* Πολλα is manifeſtly conſtrued with παρακαλων, not with ευηγγελιζετο, whoſe only regimen is τον λαον. The meaning is therefore: *Accompanied*

* 1 Tim ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11.
‖ Matth. iii. 1, 2.
† 2 Pet. ii. 5.
¶ Iſa. xl. 3.
‡ Jonah iii. 2.
** i. 7, 8.
§ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22.
†† Luke, iii. 18.

companied with many other exhortations, he publiſhed the good news to the people.

§ 5. LET us next conſider in what manner the term κηρυσσω is applied to our Saviour. The firſt time we find it uſed of him*, the very ſame proclamation or preaching is aſcribed to him, which had been aſcribed to John the Baptiſt. *Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.* With giving this this public notice he alſo began his miniſtry. Again, we are told†, that *he went over all Galilee, teaching in their ſynagogues, and* κηρυσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας, *proclaiming the good news of the reign.* There can be no doubt that the ſame proclamation is here meant, which is quoted above from the ſame chapter. Nor is this the only place wherein this expreſſion is uſed of our Lord ‡. Again, it is applied to Jeſus Chriſt by the prophet Iſaiah §, as quoted in the Goſpel ‖, as to which I ſhall only obſerve, at preſent (having made ſome remarks on the paſſage in a former Diſſertation), that the κηρυσσω, which twice occurs in it, is uſed ſolely in relation to thoſe things which were wont to be notified by proclamation. In the laſt clauſe, *to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord*, there is a manifeſt alluſion to the jubilee, which was always proclaimed by ſound of trumpet, and accompanied with a proclamation of liberty to all the bondmen and bondwomen among them. It was by proclamation, alſo, that Cyrus gave freedom to the captives of Judah, to return to their native land. I need only add, that the word κηρυσσω is ſometimes applied to our Lord indefinitely, where we are not told what he *proclaimed* or *preached*. In ſuch caſes, the rules of interpretation invariably require, that the expreſſions which are indefinite and defective, be explained by thoſe which are definite and full; and that, by conſequence, they be underſtood to ſignify, that he gave public warning of the Meſſiah's approaching reign.

§ 6. LASTLY, as to the application of the term to the Apoſtles: its firſt appearance is in the inſtructions which their Lord gave them, along with their firſt miſſion to the cities and villages of Iſrael. *As ye go*, ſays he ¶, κηρυσσετε λεγοντες, *proclaim, ſaying*, ηγγικε η βασιλεια των ουρανων, *the reign of heaven approacheth.* Here we have the very words of their preaching, or proclamation, expreſsly given them. To the ſame purpoſe, another Evangeliſt tells us **, Απεστειλεν αυτους κηρυσσειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου, which is literally, *He commiſſioned them to proclaim the reign of God.* The ſame is doubtleſs to be underſtood by Mark, who acquaints us ††, Εξηλθοντες εκηρυσσω ινα μετανοησωσι; which is ſaying, in effect, that wherever they went they made the ſame proclamation, which had been made by their Maſter, and his precurſor, before them. *Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.* Now, it deſerves our notice, that we nowhere find ſuch an order as διδασκετε λεγοντες, *teach ſaying*, where the expreſs words of their teaching are preſcribed. It was neceſſary that this ſhould differ in a manner, according to the occaſion, and be ſuited to the capacities and circumſtances of the perſons to be taught, and therefore, that it ſhould be left to the diſcretion of the teacher. No variation was neceſſary, or even proper, in the other, which was no more than the public notification of a fact, with a warning to prepare themſelves.

In the charge which our Lord gave to his Apoſtle's, after his reſurrection, he ſays ‡‡, *Go throughout all the world*, κηρυξατε το ευαγγελιον, *proclaim the good news to the whole creation.* And as the call to reformation was enforced by the promiſe of remiſſion in the name of Chriſt, theſe alſo are ſaid §§, κηρυχθηναι εις παντα τα εθνη, *to have been proclaimed to all nations.* Indemnity for paſt ſins is the foundation of the call to reform, with which the proclamation of the reign of God was always accompanied. It is proper to remark, that the form ηγγικε γαρ, uſed firſt by the Baptiſt, then by our Lord himſelf, and laſtly, by his diſciples in his lifetime, is never repeated after his reſurrection. And we have reaſon to believe, from the material alteration in circumſtances which then took place, that they have then ſaid, not as formerly, ηγγικε, but ηλθε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων. *The reign of heaven*, that is, of the Meſſiah, *is come.*

§ 7. FURTHER, I muſt take notice, that though announcing publicly the reign of the Meſſiah, comes always under the denomination, κηρυσσειν, no moral inſtructions, or doctrinal explanations, given either by our Lord, or by his Apoſtles, are ever, either in the Goſpels, or in the Acts, ſo denominated. Thus, that moſt inſtructive diſcourſe of our Lord, the longeſt that is recorded in the Goſpel, commonly named his ſermon on the mount, is called teaching by the Evangeliſt, both in introducing it, and after the concluſion ‖‖. *Opening his mouth*, διδασκειν αυτους, *he taught them, ſaying:* and, *when Jeſus had ended theſe ſayings, the people were aſtoniſhed*, επι τη διδαχη αυτου, *at his doctrine*, his manner of teaching. It is added, ην γαρ διδασκων αυτους; *for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.* He is ſaid to have been employed in teaching ¶¶, when the wiſdom, which ſhone before in his diſcourſes, excited the aſtoniſhment of all who heard him. In like manner, the inſtructions he gave by parables, are called teaching the people, not preaching to them ***; and thoſe given in private to the Apoſtles, are in the ſame way ſtyled ††† teaching, never preaching. And if teaching and preaching be

* Matth. iv. 17. † Matth. iv. 23. ‡ Matth. ix. 35. Mark, i. 14. § lxi. 1, &c. ‖ Luke, iv. 18, 19.
¶ Matth. x. 7. ** Luke ix. 2. †† vi. 12. ‡‡ Mark xvi. 15. §§ Luke xxiv. 47.
‖‖ Matth. v. 2. vii. 28, 29. ¶¶ Matth. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 2. Luke iv. 15. 22. *** Mark iv. 1, 2. ††† Mark viii, 31.

be found ſometimes coupled together, the reaſon appears to be, becauſe their teaching, in the beginning of this new diſpenſation, muſt have been frequently introduced by announcing the Meſſiah, which alone was preaching. The explanations, admonitions, arguments, and motives, that followed, came under the denomination of teaching. Nor does any thing elſe, ſpoken by our Lord and his diſciples, in his lifetime, appear to have been called preaching, but this ſingle ſentence, Μετανοειτε ηγγικε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων. In the Acts of the Apoſtles, the difference of meaning in the two words is carefully obſerved. The former is always a general and open declaration of the Meſſiah's reign, called emphatically, the good news, or goſpel; or, which amounts to the ſame, the announcing of the great foundation of our hope, the Meſſiah's reſurrection: the latter comprehends every kind of inſtruction, public or private, that is neceſſary for illuſtrating the nature and laws of this kingdom, for confuting gainſayers, perſuading the hearers, for confirming and comforting believers. The proper ſubject of each is fitly expreſſed in the concluſion of this book*; where, ſpeaking of Paul, then confined at Rome, in a hired houſe, the author tells us, that he received all who came to him, κηρυσσων την βασιλειαν του Θεου, και διδασκων τα περι του Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου. Announcing to them the reign of God, and inſtructing them in every thing that related to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

§ 8. LET it alſo be obſerved that, in all the quotations in the Goſpels, from the ancient Prophets, neither the word κηρυσσω, nor any of its conjugates, is applied to any of them beſide Jonah. What is quoted from the reſt, is ſaid to have been ſpoken, or foretold, or propheſied, but never *preached*. Jonah's prophecy to the Ninivites, is but twice quoted; and it is in both places called κηρυγμα, rendered *preaching*, properly *cry*, or *proclamation*. The ſame name it has, in the book itſelf, in the Septuagint, and with great propriety, according to the explanation above given of the word, for it was a real proclamation which God required him to make through the ſtreets of Niniveh. Thus he is charged †, *Go to Niniveh, that great city, and preach to it the preaching that I bid thee.* The very words are preſcribed. It may be obſerved here, by the way, that both in the Hebrew, and in the Greek, it is the ſame word which is here rendered *preach*, and in verſe fifth, *proclaim*, when uſed in reference to a faſt appointed by the king of Niniveh, for averting the divine anger, and notified to the people by *proclamation*. In obedience to the command of God, Jonah began to enter into the city, a day's journey, and to cry, as he had been bidden. Now, what was the *preaching* which God put into his mouth? was neither more nor leſs than this, *Yet, forty days, and Niniveh ſhall be overthrown.* This warning the Prophet, at proper diſtances, repeated as he advanced.

In one paſſage of the Apocalypſe‡, the word occurs ſo manifeſtly in the ſame ſenſe, that it is one of the two places (for there are no more) in the New Teſtament, wherein our tranſlators have rendered it *proclaim: I ſaw a ſtrong angel proclaiming, with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to looſe the ſeals thereof?* That is, whoſoever is worthy to open the book and to looſe its ſeals, may come and do it. This is the whole of the angel's κηρυγμα, preaching or proclamation. In the Acts and Epiſtles, we find the verb κηρυσσω followed by τον Χριστον, τον Ιησουν, or ſomething equivalent. This is entirely proper. To proclaim the advent of the Meſſiah, and that Jeſus is the perſon, was the firſt ſtep of their important charge, and neceſſarily preceded their teaching and explaining his doctrine, or inculcating his precepts.

§ 9. So much for the primitive and moſt common meaning of the word κηρυσσω in the New Teſtament. But, as few words in any language remain perfectly univocal, I own there are ſome inſtances in which the term is employed in this part of Scripture with greater latitude. The firſt and moſt natural extenſion of the word is when it is uſed by hyperbole for publiſhing any how, divulging, making a thing to be univerſally talked of. The firſt inſtance of this is where we are told of the leper that was cleanſed by our Lord, and charged not to divulge the manner of his cure. *But he went out*, ſays the hiſtorian§, *and began to publiſh it much*, κηρυσσειν πολλα. So our tranſlators, very properly, render the word. In ſome other places we find it in the ſame ſenſe, and in the ſame way rendered‖. All the inſtances are ſimilar, in that they relate to miraculous cures performed by our Lord, which ſome of thoſe who received, notwithſtanding the prohibition given them, were every where aſſiduous to divulge. Not that they did literally proclaim them, by crying aloud in the public places, but that they made the matter as well known, as though this method had been taken. Such hyperbolical idioms are to be found in all languages. How common is it to ſay of profligates, that they proclaim their infamy to all the world? becauſe their lives make it as notorious, as it could be made by proclamation. It is in the ſame ſenſe of publiſhing, and by the ſame figure, that proclaiming from the houſe-tops* is oppoſed to whiſpering in the ear. Nor is it certain, that the words κηρυσσω and

* Acts, xxviii. 31. † Jonah, iii. 2. ‡ Rev. v. 2. § Mark, i. 45. ‖ Matth. x. 27 Luke, xii. 3. * Ibid.

κηρυγμα have any other meaning than thoſe above ſpecified in the Goſpels and Acts.

§ 10. THE only remaining ſenſe of the words which I find in the New Teſtament, and which anſwers to the import of the Engliſh words *preach* and *preaching*, ſeems to be peculiar to the writings of Paul. *Thou*, ſays he*, *who teacheſt another, teacheſt thou not thyſelf? Thou that preacheſt, ὁ κηρυσσων, a man ſhould not ſteal, doſt thou ſteal?* The two clauſes illuſtrate each other, and ſhow that κηρυσσω in the latter has nearly the ſame import with διδασκω in the former. For, though we may ſpeak properly of proclaiming laws, and *thou ſhalt not ſteal*, is doubtleſs of the number; it is only of laws newly enacted, or at leaſt not before promulgated, that we uſe that expreſſion. The law here ſpoken of was ſufficiently known and acknowledged every where; but, though there was no occaſion for proclaiming it, it might be very neceſſary to inculcate and explain it. Now this is properly expreſſed by the word *preach*. There are ſome other places in his Epiſtles, wherein it cannot be doubted, that the word is uſed in this large acceptation for teaching publicly. Thus we ought to underſtand his admonition to Timothy†, κηρυξον τον λογον, *preach the word*. Κηρυγμα is alſo uſed by him, with the ſame latitude, for all public teaching, as when he ſays‡, *It pleaſed God, by the fooliſhneſs of preaching*, δια της μωριας του κηρυγματος, *to ſave them that believe*. Again‡, *My ſpeech and my preaching*, το κηρυγμα μου, *was not with enticing words of man's wiſdom, but in the demonſtration of the ſpirit and of power*; there can be no queſtion but the term is uſed for teaching in general, ſince κηρυγμα, in the confined ſenſe it bears in the Goſpels, could hardly admit variety or choice in the expreſſion, nor conſequently aught of the enticing words of man's wiſdom. There is, beſides, one place where the Apoſtle Peter uſes the word κηρυσσειν§, in ſpeaking of our Lord's preaching to the ſpirits in priſon: but the paſſage is ſo obſcure, that no argument can ſafely be founded on it.

§ 11. NOTHING, however, can be clearer to the attentive and critical reader of the original, than that the aforeſaid words are not uſed with the ſame latitude in the hiſtorical books. In the Acts, in particular, ſeveral diſcourſes are recorded, thoſe eſpecially of Peter and Paul, but to none of them are the terms κηρυσσω and κηρυγμα ever applied. I think it the more neceſſary to make this remark, becauſe the Engliſh word *preach* is in the common verſion frequently applied to them. Now this tends to confound the diſtinction ſo well preſerved in the hiſtory, and to render all our ideas on this head extremely indeterminate. Some will, perhaps, be ſurpriſed to be informed that there are, in the Acts alone, no fewer than ſix Greek words (not ſynonymous neither) which are (ſome of them oftener, ſome of them ſeldomer) tranſlated by the verb *preach*. The words are κηρυσσω, ευαγγελιζομαι καταγγελλω, λαλεω. διαλεγομαι, and παρρησιαζομαι which laſt is rendered *to preach boldly*. I admit that it is impoſſible, in tranſlating out of one language into another, to find a diſtinction of words in one exactly correſpondent to what obtains in the other, and ſo to preſerve uniformity, in rendering every different word by a different word, and the ſame word by the ſame word. This is what neither propriety nor perſpicuity will admit. The rule, however, to tranſlate uniformly, when it can be done, in a conſiſtency both with propriety and perſpicuity, is a good rule, and one of the ſimpleſt and ſureſt methods I know, of making us enter into the conceptions of the ſacred writers, and adopt their very turn of thinking.

§ 12. I SHALL here take notice only of two paſſages in the common tranſlation, which, to a reader unacquainted with the original, may appear to contradict my remark in regard to the diſtinction ſo carefully obſerved by the hiſtorian. *When the Jews*, ſays he‖, *were gone out of the ſynagogue, the Gentiles beſought, that theſe words might be preached to them* λαληθηναι αυτοις τα ρηματα ταυτα *the next Sabbath*; literally and ſimply, *that theſe words might be ſpoken to them*. The words here meant, are thoſe contained in the twenty-ſix preceding verſes. Our tranſlators, I ſuppoſe, have been the more inclinable to call it preaching, becauſe ſpoken in a ſynagogue by permiſſion of the rulers. In another place**, *when the diſciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them* διελεγετο αυτοις. Soon after††, *as Paul was long preaching*, διαλεγομενου του πλειον. Διαλεγομαι is properly *diſſero, diſputo*. It occurs frequently in the Acts, but, except in this paſſage, is always rendered *to reaſon*, or *to diſpute*. I own that neither of theſe words ſuits the context here, as it appears that all preſent were diſciples. The word, however, implies not only *to diſpute*, but *to diſcourſe* on any ſubject. But what I take the freedom to cenſure in our tranſlators, is not their rendering διαλεγομαι in this place *preach*, which, conſidered by itſelf, might be juſtified; but it is by their confounding it with ſo many words not ſynonymous, particularly with κηρυσσω, whoſe meaning in this book, as well as in the Goſpels, is totally different.

§ 13. Now, in regard to the manner wherein this word has been tranſlated, with which I ſhall finiſh what

* Rom. ii. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 2. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 21. 1 Cor. ii. 4. § 1 Pet. iii. 19. ‖ Acts, xiii. 42. ** Acts, xx. 7. †† 9.

what relates peculiarly to it, we may obſerve, that *prædicare*, uſed in the Vulgate, and in all the Latin verſions, correſponds entirely to the Greek word in its primitive meaning, and ſignifies to give public notice by proclamation. In this ſenſe it had been uſed by the Latin claſſics, long before the tranſlation of the Bible into their tongue. But *prædicare*, having been employed uniformly in rendering κηρυσσειν, not only in the hiſtory, but in the Epiſtles, has derived from the latter uſe, a ſignification different, and much more limited than it has in profane authors. Now this additional, or acquired ſignification, is that which has principally obtained amongſt eccleſiaſtics; and hence has ariſen the ſole meaning in modern languages aſcribed to the word, whereby they commonly render the Greek κηρυσσω. The Latin word is manifeſtly that from which the Italian *predicare*, the French *precher*, and the Engliſh *to preach*, are derived. Yet theſe three words correſpond to the Latin only in the laſt mentioned and eccleſiaſtical ſenſe, not in the primitive and claſſical, which is alſo the ſcriptural ſenſe in the Goſpels and Acts. Thus the learned Academicians della Cruſca, in their Vocabulary, interpret the Italian *predicare*, not by the Latin *prædicare*, its etymon, but by *concionari*, *concionem habere*; terms certainly much nearer than the other to the import of the word uſed in the other two languages mentioned, tho' by no means adapted to expreſs the ſenſe of κηρυσσειν in the hiſtorical books. This is another evidence of what was obſerved in a former Diſſertation*, that a miſtake, occaſioned by ſuppoſing the word in the original, exactly correſpondent to the term in the common verſion, by which it is uſually rendered, is often confirmed, inſtead of being corrected by recurring to tranſlations into other modern tongues, inaſmuch as from the ſame, or ſimilar cauſes, the like deviation from the original import, has been produced in theſe languages, as in our own.

§ 14. I SHOULD now examine critically the import of the word ευαγγελιζω, often rendered in the ſame way with κηρυσσω. But what might have been offered on this ſubject, I have in a great meaſure anticipated, in the explanation I gave of the name ευαγγελιον. It was impoſſible to conſider the noun and the verb ſeparately, without either repeating the ſame obſervations and criticiſms on each, or, by dividing things ſo cloſely connected, injuring the illuſtration of both. I ſhall therefore here, after referring the reader to that Diſſertation†, which is pretty full, point out, in the briefeſt manner, the chief diſtinctions in meaning that may be remarked between this word and κηρυσσω already explained.

The former always refers to a meſſage or news in itſelf good and agreeable, the latter does not require this quality in the ſubject. What would come under the denomination of κακαγγελια, *bad news*, may be the ſubject of κηρυγμα, *proclamation*, as well as good news. We ſay, with equal propriety, κηρυσσειν πολεμον as κηρυσσειν ειρηνην, to proclaim war, as to proclaim peace. Nay Jonah's cry through the ſtreets of Niniveh, *Yet forty days, and Niniveh ſhall be overthrown*, is denominated κηρυγμα both in the Old Teſtament and in the New. But this is no where, nor indeed could be, ſtyled ευαγγελιον, *glad tidings*.

A ſecond difference is, the word κηρυσσω implies that the notification is made openly to many, whereas the word ευαγγελιζομαι may not improperly be uſed, in whatever way the thing be notified, publicly or privately, aloud or in a whiſper, to one or to many. Thus, in regard to the important and agreeable meſſage delivered by Gabriel to Zacharias the father of John the Baptiſt, when the latter was alone in the ſanctuary offering incenſe; the archangel ſays ‡, *I am ſent*, ευαγγελισασθαι σοι ταυτα, *to ſhow thee theſe glad tidings*. And it is ſaid of Philip, when in the chariot with only the Ethiopian eunuch §, ευηγγελισατο αυτω τον Ιησουν. *He preached to him Jeſus*. The term *preached*, by which our tranſlators have rendered the word, does not in this place reach the meaning of the Greek word, nor does it anſwer to the ordinary acceptation of the Engliſh. It does not reach the meaning of the Greek, as the quality of the ſubject, its being good news, is not ſuggeſted. Nor is the Engliſh word proper here; for this teaching was neither public, nor have we reaſon to believe it was a continued diſcourſe. It is much more probable, that it was in the familiar way of dialogue, in which he had begun, that Philip continued to inſtruct this ſtranger in the doctrine of Chriſt.

Another diſtinction ſeems to ariſe from the original import of the words, though I will not ſay that it is uniformly obſerved. It is, that the word ευαγγελιζω relates to the firſt information that is given to a perſon or people, that is, when the ſubject may be properly called *news*. Thus, in the Acts, it is frequently uſed for expreſſing the firſt publication of the Goſpel in a city or a village, or amongſt a particular people. In regard to the word κηρυσσω, there is no impropriety in ſpeaking of the ſame thing as repeatedly proclaimed among the ſame people. Thus the approach of the reign of God was, in fact, proclaimed to the Jews in our Saviour's lifetime, firſt by the Baptiſt, then by our Lord himſelf, afterwards

* Diſſ. III. § 6. † Diſſ. V. Part II. ‡ Luke, i. 19. § Acts, viii. 35.

afterwards by the Apoſtles, and laſtly by the ſeventy diſciples. I ſhall only add, that the word εὐαγγελίζομαι is ſometimes, though not often, uſed more indefinitely for teaching or preaching in general *. In one place †, it is rendered by our tranſlators *declared*. But in the Goſpels, it always preſerves the primitive ſignification. When, therefore, we find it there coupled with the verb διδάσκω, we are not to underſtand the terms as ſynonymous, but as intended to acquaint us that the teaching mentioned was accompanied, or perhaps introduced, with an intimation of the approaching reign of the Meſſiah.

The moſt obvious things are ſometimes the moſt apt to be overlooked by ingenious men. We ſhould otherwiſe think it unaccountable that men, eminent for their attainments in ſacred literature, ſhould be ſo far miſled by the ordinary meaning of a phraſe in the tranſlation, as entirely to forget the proper import of the original expreſſion. I am led to this reflection by obſerving, in a late publication, the following remark ‡ on Luke xx. 1. "διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ—"καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου. Why this ſpecification of *preach-*"*ing the goſpel?* Did he not always *preach the goſpel*"when *he taught the people?* Hence I conclude, that "καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ſhould be thrown out as a margi-"nal reading, founded perhaps on Matth. iv. 23. or "ix. 35." Doubtleſs, according to the import of the Engliſh phraſe, he always preached the goſpel when he taught, inaſmuch as his teaching conſiſted either in explaining the doctrine, or enforcing the precepts of the Chriſtian religion, which is all that we mean by *preaching the goſpel*. But his teaching was not always (as is manifeſt from his whole hiſtory) attended with the intimation above mentioned, which, in that hiſtory, is the only thing implied in εὐαγγελιζομένου, though it was ſometimes attended with it. A cloſe verſion of the words removes every difficulty, *One day, as he was teaching the people in the temple, and publiſhing the good tidings.* In my judgment, this laſt circumſtance was the more worthy of being ſpecified here by the Evangeliſt, as it has probably been that which then incenſed the chief prieſts, and prompted them to demand of him in ſo peremptory a manner to ſhow his warrant for what he did. To ſay that the reign of the Meſſiah was about to commence, would be accounted by them very preſumptuous, and might be conſtrued into an inſinuation, that he himſelf was the Meſſiah, a poſition which we find them ſoon after pronouncing blaſphemy: and in any caſe they would conſider the declaration (which was well known not to originate from them) as an attempt to undermine their authority with the people.

Hence I alſo will take the liberty to conclude, that the common way of rendering the Greek verb, by the aid of conſecrated words, not only into Engliſh, but into Latin, and moſt modern languages, has produced an aſſociation in the minds of men ſtrong enough to miſlead critical, as well as ordinary, readers; elſe men of letters, like Dr. Owen and Mr. Bowyer, had never fancied that there is here either a tautology, or ſo much as a redundancy of words. I further conclude, that if we were to proceed in the way propoſed by the former of theſe critics, and to expunge whatever in Scripture we diſlike, or imagine might be ſpared, it is impoſſible to ſay what would be left at laſt of the divine oracles. The remarker, if he would act conſiſtently, ought alſo to throw out as a marginal reading κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον, which is coupled with διδασκων in the two places of Matthew referred to. We may not be able to diſcover the meaning or the uſe of a particular expreſſion; for who can diſcover every thing? but let us not be vain enough to think, that what we do not diſcover, no other perſon ever will §.

§ 15. THE only other word in the New Teſtament that can be ſaid to be nearly ſynonymous with either of the preceding, is καταγγελλω *annuncio*, I announce, publiſh, or promulgate. It is an intermediate term between κηρυσσω and εὐαγγελιζομαι. In regard to the manner, it implies more of public notice than is neceſſarily implied in εὐαγγελιζομαι, but leſs than is denoted by κηρυσσω. In regard to the ſubject, though commonly uſed in a good ſenſe, it does not expreſs quite ſo much as εὐαγγελιζομαι, but it expreſſes more than κηρυσσω, which generally refers to ſome one remarkable fact or event, that may be told in a ſentence or two. Accordingly both theſe words, καταγγελλω and εὐαγγελιζομαι come nearer to a coincidence in ſignification with διδασκω than κηρυσσω does.

§ 16. THE word εὐαγγελιστης, rendered *evangeliſt*, occurs only thrice in the New Teſtament. Firſt in the Acts ‖, where Philip one of the ſeven deacons, is called an evangeliſt; ſecondly, in the Epiſtle to the Epheſians ¶, where *evangeliſts* are mentioned after apoſtles and prophets, as one of the offices which our Lord, after his aſcenſion, had appointed for the converſion of infidels, and the eſtabliſhment of order in his church; and, laſtly, in the injunction which Paul gives Timothy to do the work of an evangeliſt **. This

* Acts, xiv. 15. Gal. i. 23.
† Rev. x. 7.
‡ Bowyer's Conjectures.
§ Diſſ. XII. Part II. § 13, 14.
‖ Acts, 21. 8.
¶ Eph. iv. 11.
** 2 Tim. iv. 5.

This word has alſo obtained another ſignification, which, though not canonical, is very ancient. As εὐαγγέλιον ſometimes denotes any of the four narratives of our Lord's life and ſufferings, which make a part of the canon, ſo evangeliſt means the compoſer. Hence Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are called evangeliſts.

§ 17. As to the word διδασκειν, it may ſuffice to obſerve, that it can hardly ever be wrong tranſlated into Latin by the verb *docere*, or into Engliſh by the verb *to teach*; and that it was mentioned in the title, not on account of any difficulty occaſioned by it, but ſolely for the ſake of ſuggeſting my purpoſe to ſhow that, far from being coincident, it has not even ſo great an affinity in ſignification to the other words there mentioned, as is commonly ſuppoſed. But, as the ſuppoſed coincidence or affinity always ariſes from miſtaking the exact import of the other words, and not from any error in regard to this, a particular explanation of this term is not neceſſary.

DISSERTATION THE SEVENTH.

Inquiry into the Import of certain Titles of Honour occurring in the New Teſtament.

I INTEND, in this Diſſertation, to offer a few remarks on thoſe titles of honour which moſt frequently occur in the New Teſtament, that we may judge more accurately of their import, by attending, not only to their peculiarities in ſignification, but alſo to the difference in the ancient Jewiſh manner of applying them, from that which obtains among the modern Europeans, in the uſe of words thought to be equivalent.

PART I.

Κυριος.

NOTHING can be more evident, than that, originally, titles were every where the names, either of offices, or of relations, natural or conventional, inſomuch that it could not be ſaid of any of them, as may be ſaid, with juſtice, of ſeveral of our titles at preſent, thoſe eſpecially called titles of quality, that they mark neither office nor relation, property nor juriſdiction, but merely certain degrees of hereditary honour, and rights of precedency. Relation implies oppoſite relation in the object. Now, when thoſe perſons, for whoſe behoof a particular office was exerciſed, and who were conſequently in the oppoſite relation, were very numerous, as a whole nation, province, or kingdom, the language commonly had no correlate to the title expreſſing the office; that is, it had not a term appropriated to denote the people who ſtood in the oppoſite relation. But when there was only a ſmall number, there was a ſpecial term for denoting the relative connection in which theſe alſo ſtood. Thus the terms, *king*, *judge*, *prophet*, *pontiff*, hardly admitted any correlative term, but the general one of *people*. But this does not hold invariably. With us the correlate to *king* is *ſubject*. In like manner, offices which are exerciſed, not ſtatedly, to certain individuals, but variouſly and occaſionally, ſometimes to one, ſometimes to another, do not often require titles correlative. Of this kind are the names of moſt handicrafts, and ſeveral other profeſſions. Yet, with us, the *phyſician* has his *patients*, the *lawyer* his *clients*, and the *tradeſman* his *cuſtomers*. In moſt other caſes of relation, whether ariſing from nature or from convention, we find title tallying with title exactly. Thus *father* has *ſon*, *huſband* has *wife*, *uncle* has *nephew*, *teacher* has *diſciple* or *ſcholar*, *maſter* has *ſervant*.

§ 2. I ADMIT, however, that in the moſt ſimple times, and the moſt ancient uſages with which we are acquainted, things did not remain ſo entirely on the original footing, as that none ſhould be called *father*, but by his *ſon* or his *daughter*; none ſhould be ſaluted *maſter*, but by his *ſervant*, or ſtyled *teacher* but by his *ſcholar*. There is a progreſſion in every thing relating to language, as, indeed, in all human ſciences and arts. Neceſſity, firſt, and ornament, afterwards, lead to the extenſion of words beyond their primitive ſignification. All languages are ſcanty in the beginning, not having been fabricated beforehand, to ſuit the occaſions which might ariſe. Now, when a perſon, in ſpeaking, is ſenſible of the want of a proper ſign for expreſſing his thought, he, much more naturally, recurs to a word which is the known name of ſomething that has an affinity to what he means, than to a ſound which, being entirely

ly new to the hearers, cannot, by any law of aſſociation in our ideas, ſuggeſt his meaning to them. Whereas, by availing himſelf of the name of ſomething related, by reſemblance, or otherwiſe, to the ſentiment he wants to convey, he touches ſome principle in the minds of thoſe whom he addreſſes, which (if they be perſons of any ſagacity) will quickly lead them to the diſcovery of his meaning. Thus, for expreſſing the reverence which I feel for a reſpectable character, in one who is alſo my ſenior, I ſhall naturally be led to ſtyle him *father*, though I be not literally his *ſon*; to expreſs my ſubmiſſion to a man of greater merit and dignity, I ſhall call him *maſter*, though I be not his *ſervant*: and, to expreſs my reſpect for one of more extenſive knowledge and erudition, I ſhall denominate him *teacher*, though I be not his *diſciple*. Indeed, theſe conſequences ariſe ſo directly from thoſe eſſential principles of the imagination, uniformly to be found in human nature, that deviations, in ſome degree ſimilar, from the earlieſt meanings of words, are to be found in all tongues, ancient and modern. This is the firſt ſtep from pure ſimplicity.

§ 3. YET, that the differences in laws, ſentiments and manners, which obtain in different nations, will occaſion in this, as well as in other things, conſiderable variety, is not to be denied. In Aſia, a common ſign of reſpect to ſuperiors was proſtration. In Europe, that ceremony was held in abhorrence. What I have remarked above, ſuits entirely the progreſs of civilization in the Aſiatic regions. The high-ſpirited republicans of Greece and Rome, appear, on the contrary, long to have conſidered the *kyrios*, or *dominus*, given to a man, as proper only in the mouth of a ſlave. Octavius, the emperor, when maſter of the world, and abſolute in Rome, ſeems not to have thought it prudent to accept it. But, in deſpotic countries, and countries long accuſtomed to kingly government, it was otherwiſe.

§ 4. THAT ſuch honorary applications of words were quite common among the Jews, is evident to every body, who has read the Bible with attention. In ſuch applications, however, it muſt be noted, that the titles are not conſidered as ſtrictly due from thoſe who give them. They are conſidered rather as voluntary expreſſions of reſpect, in him who gives the title, being a ſort of tribute, either to politeneſs, or to the perſonal merit of him on whom it is beſtowed. But, to affix titles to places and offices, to be given by all who ſhall addreſs thoſe poſſeſſed of ſuch places and offices, whether they that give them ſtand in the relation correſpondent to the title or not, or whether they poſſeſs the reſpect or eſteem implied or not, is comparatively a modern refinement in the civil intercourſe of mankind, at leaſt in the degree to which it is carried in Europe. This is the ſecond remove from the earlieſt and ſimpleſt ſtate of ſociety.

§ 5. THERE remains a third, ſtill more remarkable, to which I find nothing ſimilar in ancient times. We have gotten a number of honorary titles, ſuch as *duke*, *marquis*, *earl*, *viſcount*, *baron*, *baronet*, &c. which it would be very difficult, or rather impoſſible, to define; as they expreſs, at preſent, neither office nor relation, but which, nevertheleſs, deſcend from father to ſon, are regarded as part of a man's inheritance, and, without any conſideration of merit, or ſtation, or wealth, ſecure to him certain titular honours and ceremonial reſpect, and which are of a more unalienable nature than any other property (if they may be called property), real or perſonal, that he poſſeſſes. I am ſenſible, that thoſe modern titles were all originally names of offices, as well as the ancient. Thus, *duke* was equivalent to commander; *marquis*, or margrave (for they differed in different countries), to guardian of the marches; *count*, landgrave, alderman, or *earl*, to ſheriff; whence the ſhire is ſtill denominated county; *viſcount*, to deputy-ſheriff. *Vicecomes*, accordingly, is the Latin word, in law-writs, for the officiating ſheriff*. When the principal, in any kind of office, becomes too rich, and too lazy, for the ſervice, the burthen naturally devolves upon the ſubſtitute; and the power of the conſtituent, through diſuſe, comes at laſt to be antiquated. But, ſo much was the title once connected with the office, that when the king intended to create a new *earl*, he had no other expedient, than to erect a certain territory into a *county*, *earldom*, or *ſheriffdom* (for theſe words were then ſynonymous), and to beſtow the juriſdiction of it on the perſon honoured with the title. The *baron*, though this name was anciently common to all the nobility, was judge or lord of a ſmaller and ſubordinate juriſdiction, called a barony†. In proceſs of time, through the viciſſitudes that neceſſarily happen in the manners of the people, and in their methods of government, the offices came gradually to be ſuperſeded, or at leaſt to ſubſiſt no longer, on the ſame footing of hereditary poſſeſſion. But, when theſe had given place to other political arrangements, the titles, as a badge of anceſtry, and of the right to certain privileges which accompanied the name, were, as we may naturally ſuppoſe, ſtill ſuf-

fered

* Blackſtone's Commentary, Introduc. Sect. 4. and B. I. ch. xii. § 3. 4.
† See Spelman's Gloſſary on the different names.

fered to remain. It hardly now anſwers the firſt end, as a badge of anceſtry, in thoſe countries where there are often new creations: but it anſwers the ſecond, and beſides, ennobles their poſterity. In conſequence of theſe differences, the titles are regarded as due to him who ſucceeds to them, alike from all men, and that without any conſideration of either perſonal or official dignity, or even of territorial poſſeſſions. Thus, one who is entitled to be called my lord, is, in this manner, addreſſed not only by his inferiors, but by his equals, nay, even his ſuperiors. The king himſelf, in addreſſing his nobles, ſays, my lords.

§ 6. It was totally different among the Hebrews, I might have ſaid, among the ancients in general. The Greek word κυριος *kyrios*, anſwering to the Hebrew אדון *adon*, to the Latin *Dominus*, and to the words *lord* or *maſter* in Engliſh, was not originally given, unleſs by a ſervant to his maſter, by a ſubject to his ſovereign, or in brief, by one bound to obey, to the perſon entitled to command. Soon, however, it became common to give it to a ſuperior, though the perſon who gave it, had no dependence upon him; and if ſometimes it was, through complaiſance, beſtowed on an equal; ſtill the man who gave the title, was conſidered as modeſtly putting himſelf on the footing of an inferior and ſervant, inaſmuch as the title was invariably underſtood to expreſs, not only ſuperior rank, but even authority, in the perſon on whom it was conferred. We have examples in Scripture which put it beyond a doubt, that for any man to addreſs another by the title my lord, and to acknowledge himſelf that perſon's ſervant, were but different ways of expreſſing the ſame thing, κυριος and δουλος being correlative terms. The courteous form of addreſſing with them, when they meant to be reſpectful (for it was not uſed on all occaſions), was not that of moſt modern Europeans, who, in uſing the ſecond perſonal pronoun, employ the plural for the ſingular; nor that of the Germans, who change both perſon and number, making the third plural ſerve for the ſecond ſingular, but it was what more rarely could occaſion ambiguity than either of theſe; the ſubſtitution of the third perſon for the firſt, the number being retained, whether ſingular or plural. This mode, as occurring in Scripture, gives an additional illuſtration of the import of the term κυριος with them. "Let *thy ſervant*, I pray thee," ſaid Judah * to his brother Joſeph, when governor of Egypt, "ſpeak a word in my lord's ears." "Nay, my lord," ſaid the Shunamite to the Prophet Eliſha, "do not deceive *thine handmaid* †." Some other inſtances are marked in the margin ‡.

Aſſiſted by theſe remarks we may perceive the force of that obſervation of the Apoſtle Peter §, in regard to the conjugual reſpect and obedience yielded by Sarah to her huſband Abraham. *Being in ſubjection*, ſays he, ſpeaking of the wives, *to their own huſbands, even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord*: that is, acknowledging by this her uſual compellation, her inferiority, and obligation to obedience; for the intimacy of their relation hinders us from aſcribing it to a ceremonious civility. Some have cavilled at this argument brought by the Apoſtle. The rank and quality of Abraham, ſay they, who, by the accounts we have of him, was a powerful prince, entitled him to be addreſſed in this manner by every body. Others, in the oppoſite extreme, have inferred that every dutiful wife ought to give the ſame teſtimony of reſpect and ſubmiſſion to her huſband, which this pious matron did to the Patriarch. Both ways of reaſoning are weak, and proceed from the ſame ignorance of the different import of words, reſulting from the difference of manners and cuſtoms. The title *lord* with us, as applied to men, is either hereditary in certain families, or annexed by royal authority, or immemorial uſage, to certain offices and ſtations. Wherever it is conſidered as due, nobody, of what rank ſoever, withholds it. And wherever it is not due, one would not only expoſe one's ſelf to ridicule by giving it, but, inſtead of paying a compliment to the perſon addreſſed, would put him out of countenance. It cannot, therefore, with us, ſerve as a token of ſubjection in the perſon who gives it. Such is the conſequence of the different footing whereon things now ſtand, that the titles which, in thoſe times of ſimplicity, were merely relative and ambulatory, are now abſolute and ſtationary. Whereas the man who, in thoſe ages, was well entitled to the compellation of *lord* in one company, had no title to it at all in another. It happens with us frequently (to wit, as often as two or more who, by law or cuſtom, have a right to that mark of reſpect, converſe together), that the title of *lord* is reciprocally given and taken by the ſame perſons. But of this I do not recollect a ſingle inſtance in Scripture. Such a thing to the ancients muſt doubtleſs, have appeared ridiculous, as an acknowledgment of ſuperiority in the perſon on whom it was conferred, was always underſtood to be conveyed

* Gen. xliv. 18. † 2 Kings, iv. 16. ‡ Gen. xxxii. 4, 5. xxxiii. 5. 8. xlii. 10. 1 Kings, xviii. 7. 9.
§ 1 Pet. iii. 5. 6.

veyed by it. For, though it was ſometimes, as I obſerved, politely given to an equal, he was thereby treated as ſuperior: and, as each could not be ſuperior, to retort the title on him who gave it, muſt have been conſidered by them, as an indelicate rejection of the civility offered. To their ſentiments it ſeems to have been more conformable, that the honour ſhould be repaid with ſome other marks of reſpect or affection, by the perſon who received it. The fact, if I remember right, is certain: this manner of accounting for it, I acknowledge to be no more than conjecture; but it is a conjecture which ſome paſſages in ancient hiſtory, particularly the converſation of Abraham with Ephron and the ſons of Heth *, and Jacob's interview with his elder brother Eſau †, after an an abſence of more than fourteen yeares, render not improbable.

§ 7. The title of *maſter* (for the Hebrew *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*, ſignify no more) was perhaps univerſally the firſt which, by a kind of catachreſis, was beſtowed on a ſuperior, or a perſon conſidered as ſuch, by one who was not his ſervant or dependent. But ſtill, as it implied the acknowledgment of ſuperiority, it varied with the company. There were few ſo low who were not entitled to this honourable compellation from ſome perſons; there were none (the king alone excepted) ſo high as to be entitled to it from every perſon. Joab, who was captain-general of the army, is properly ſtyled by Uriah ‡, who was only an inferior officer, *my lord* Joab, but had the king himſelf, or any of the princes, given him that title, it could have been underſtood no otherwiſe than in deriſion. It would have been, as if the ſovereign ſhould call any of his miniſters his maſter. The title *father*, though held in general ſuperior to *lord*, yet, as the reſpect expreſſed by it, implied ſuperiority, not in ſtation, but in years, experience, and knowledge, was ſometimes given to the Prophets of the true God, even by kings. Thus, the Prophet Eliſha is in this manner addreſſed by the king of Iſrael §; but no prophet is ever denominated lord or maſter by one veſted with the ſupreme authority. By others the prophets were often ſo denominated. Thus Obadiah, who was ſteward of the king's houſehold, calls the Prophet Elijah, my lord Elijah ‖. The ſame title we find alſo given to Eliſha ¶. Wheras to the king himſelf, the common addreſs, from men of all ranks, was, *my lord, O king*, or, as the expreſſion ſtrictly implied, *O king, my maſter*; but by the king, the title *my lord*, or *my maſter*, was given to none but God. The reaſon is obvious. A monarch, who was not tributary, acknowledged, in point of ſtation, no earthly ſuperior. And though, in any rank inferior to the higheſt, good breeding might require it to be conferred on an equal, the royal dignity appears generally to have been conſidered as of too delicate a nature to admit the uſe of ſuch compliments without derogation. Crœſus king of Lydia, is repreſented by Herodotus **, as giving the title δεσποτης, which is of the ſame import, to Cyrus king of Perſia; but it was after his kingdom was conquered by Cyrus, and when he himſelf was his captive, and conſequently, according to the uſages of thoſe times, his ſlave. Before that event he would have diſdained to ſalute any man with this compellation. Ahab king of Iſrael, ſtyled Benhadad king of Syria, *my lord*; but it was when, through fear, he conſented to ſurrender himſelf and all that he had, into his hands ††.

I am not, however, certain that the politeneſs of the Orientals, which, in the judgment of the Greeks, ſavoured of ſervility, did not ſometimes carry them thus far: for, though no ſuch title is found in the converſation between Solomon and the queen Sheba ‡‡, or between Jehoſhaphat king of Judah, and Ahab king of Iſrael §§ as related either in the Firſt Book of Kings, or in the Second Book of Chronicles; or in the correſpondence between Hiram King of Tyre and Solomon, as related in the Firſt Book of Kings ¶¶; yet, in the account we have of this correſpondence in the Second Book of Chronicles ***, which is, by the bye, of much later date, Hiram is repreſented as giving this title to both David and Solomon. Whether this ought to be conſidered, as merely a ſtrain of eaſtern complaiſance, or as an acknowledgment of ſubordination, a ſtate to which many of the neighbouring princes had been reduced by thoſe monarchs, I will not take upon me to ſay. But it may hold as a general truth, that when this title is found given to a man in any ancient author, particularly in Scripture, before we can judge from it of the quality of the perſon accoſted, we muſt know ſomething of the quality of the perſon that accoſts. It is not ſo with us, or in any Chriſtian European country at preſent. When we find one addreſſed with the title of *highneſs*, or *grace*, or *lordſhip*, we diſcover his rank, without needing to know any thing of the addreſſer, ſave only, that he is not ignorant of the current forms of civility.

When we find that Mary Magdalene addreſſes,

* Gen. xxiii. 3, &c. † xxxiii. 1——14. ‡ 2 Sam. xi. 11. § 2 Kings, vi. 21.
‖ 1 Kings, xviii. 7 13. ¶ 2 Kings, ii. 19. iv. 16. 28. ** Lib. I. †† 1 Kings, xx. 4. ‡‡ 1 Kings, x.
§§ 1 Kings, xxii. 2 Chron. xviii. ¶¶ 1 Kings, ix. 10, &c. *** 2 Chron. ii. 14, 15.

with the title of lord (κυριε is her word *, one whom ſhe took to be no higher than a gardener, we are apt to accuſe her, in our hearts, either of flattery or of groſs ignorance, to accoſt a man in ſo low a ſtation with ſo high a title. But the ignorance is entirely our own, when we would vainly make our ideas, modes, and uſages, a ſtandard for other ages and nations. Mary and a gardener might, in the world's account, have been on a level in point of rank. If ſo, as he was a ſtranger to her, modeſty and the laws of courteſy led her to yield to him the ſuperiority, by giving him this reſpectful title. Abraham's ſervant was addreſſed in the ſame way by Rebekah, before ſhe knew him †. Paul and Silas, who cannot be ſuppoſed ſuperior in figure and appearance to ordinary mechanics, were, after having been publicly ſtripped beaten, impriſoned, and put in the ſtocks, accoſted with the title κυριοι *lords* ‡, though the common tranſlation has it *ſirs*. But it was given by a jailor, and, it may added, after a miraculous interpoſition of heaven in their favour. To ſatisfy us, however, that this laſt circumſtance was not neceſſary to entitle mean people to be addreſſed in this manner by thoſe, whoſe condition was equally mean or meaner; we may obſerve that the ſame title κυριε is given to Philip §, one of the Apoſtles from Bethſaida of Galilee, who was probably not above the rank of a fiſherman. The perſons who gave it were Greeks, doubtleſs of the loweſt ſort, who had come to Jeruſalem to worſhip. With us the title *lord*, given to one who by law or cuſtom has no right to it, is a ſort of injury to the whole order to whom the conſtitution of their country has given an excluſive privilege to be ſo denomited. With them it could affect no third perſon whatever, as it implied merely that the perſon ſpoken to was, by the ſpeaker, acknowledged his ſuperior.

It may appear to ſome an objection againſt this account of the relative import of the words *adon* and *kyrios*, that in the Engliſh Bible, we find the title *lord*, in one place of the ſacred hiſtory, uſed as we ſhould uſe the word *nobleman* or *grandee*, for denoting a perſon of a certain determinate rank. Thus we are informed of a *lord*, on whoſe hand king Jehoram leaned, who is mentioned thrice under this deſcription in the ſame chapter ‖. I acknowledge that if the Hebrew word there were *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*, it would ſuffice to overturn what has been here advanced in regard to the difference between the ancient uſe of ſuch titles and the modern. But it is not *adon* and *kyrios*. In neither language is it a title of honour, but a mere name of office. In Hebrew it is שלישׁ *ſhaliſh*, in Greek τριστατης *triſtates*, a word which occurs often in other places, and is never tranſlated *lord*, but always *captain*, as it ought to have been rendered here. The Vulgate interprets it, not *dominus quidam*, but very properly *unus de ducibus*. Again, in the common verſion, we find mention of the *king and his lords* ¶, preciſely in the manner wherein an Engliſh hiſtorian would ſpeak of his ſovereign and the peers of the realm. But neither here is the Hebrew word *adon*, nor the Greek *kyrios*. It is שריו *ſharaio*, in the former, and οι αρχοντες αυτου in the latter. In the Vulgate it is rendered *principes ejus*, and ought to have been in Engliſh *his chief men*, or *his principal officers*. Whereas אדניו *adonaio* in Hebrew, οι κυριοι αυτου in Greek, and *Domini ejus* in Latin, would have meant *his maſters*, or thoſe whom he ſerved, a ſenſe quite foreign from the purpoſe. But though our word *lords*, uſed as in the above quotations, is not unſuitable to the Engliſh ſtyle; it would have been better, in ſuch inſtances, to conform to the Hebrew idiom, for a reaſon which will appear from the next paragraph. Herod is ſaid by our tranſlators, to have made a ſupper to his *lords* **. The words is μεγιστασιν *grandees*. I ſhall only add, that the term *lords* is alſo uſed in the Engliſh tranſlation, where the correſponding words, both in Hebrew and in Greek, are names of offices equivalent to rulers, magiſtrates, governors of provinces. And therefore nothing can be concluded from the application of this title in the verſion.

§ 8. Now, with the aid of the above obſervations, on the relative value of honorary titles among the ancients, we may diſcover the full force of our Saviour's argument, in regard to the dignity of the Meſſiah. The modern uſe, in this particular, is ſo different from the ancient, that, without knowing this circumſtance, and reflecting upon it, a proper apprehenſion of the reaſoning is unattainable. I ſhall give the whole paſſages as rendered in this verſion ††. *While ſo many Phariſees were preſent, Jeſus aſked them, ſaying, What think ye of the Meſſiah? Whoſe Son ſhould he be? They anſwered, David's. He replied, How then doth David, ſpeaking by inſpiration, calls him his Lord? The Lord, ſaith he, ſaid to my Lord, ſit at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footſtool. If the Meſſiah were David's Son, would David call him his Lord? To this none of them could anſwer.* They were confounded. Yet from our very different uſages, whereby ſuch titles, if due at all, are due alike from ſuperiors as from inferiors and equals; we cannot eaſily, at firſt, feel the ſtrength of this argument. I have obſerved already, that an independent monarch, ſuch as David, acknowledged no lord or maſter but God. Far leſs would

* John, xx. 15. † Gen. xxiv. 18. ‡ Acts, xvi. 30. § John, xii. 21. ‖ 2 Kings, vii. 2, 17, 19.
¶ Ezra, viii. 25. ** Mark, vi. 21. †† Matth. xxii. 41, &c.

would he beſtow this title on a ſon or deſcendant. It was cuſtomary, becauſe reſpectful, and in the natural order of ſubordination, for a ſon ſo to addreſs his father. Accordingly, in the parable of the man who had two ſons, the elder ſon is thus repreſented as anſwering his father, εγω κυριε *. It is the ſame word which is commonly rendered *lord*, but in this place *ſir*. The ſame title was alſo given by Rachel to her father Laban, when he came into her tent, in queſt of his images †, and even by Jacob, after his return from Padan Aram, to his elder brother Eſau ‡. In no inſtance, however, will it be found given by a father to his ſon. This, according to their notions of paternal dignity and authority, which were incomparably higher than ours, would have been prepoſterous. The Phariſees, and other hearers, were ſo ſenſible of this that, however much they ſhowed themſelves, on moſt occaſions, diſpoſed to cavil, our Saviour's obſervations ſtruck them dumb. *None of them could anſwer.*

§ 9. THOUGH the general belief of the Jews at that time was, that the Meſſiah would be a much greater man than David, a mighty conqueror, and even a univerſal monarch, the ſovereign of the kings of the earth, who was to ſubdue all nations, and render them tributary to the choſen people; yet they ſtill ſuppoſed him to be a mere man, poſſeſſed of no higher nature than that which he derived from his earthly progenitors. Though their rabbies at that time agreed that the words quoted were ſpoken of the Meſſiah, and ſpoken by David, the difficulty ſuggeſted by our Lord ſeems never to have occurred to them; and now, that it was mentioned, they appeared, by their ſilence, to admit that, on the received hypotheſis, it was incapable of a ſolution. It was plainly our Saviour's intention to inſinuate, that there was, in this character, as delineated by the Prophets, and ſuggeſted by the royal Pſalmiſt, ſomething ſuperior to human, which they were not aware of. And, though he does not, in expreſs words, give the ſolution, he leaves no perſon who reflects, at a loſs to infer it. I have been the more particular in this illuſtration, in order to ſhew of how much importance it is, for attaining a critical acquaintance with the import of words in the ſacred languages, to become acquainted with the cuſtoms, ſentiments, and manners of the people.

§ 10. THE name κυριος, in the New Teſtament, is moſt frequently tranſlated, in the common verſion, *lord*, ſometimes *ſir*, ſometimes *maſter*, and once *owner*. It correſponds pretty nearly, except when it is employed in tranſlating the name *Jehovah*, to the Latin *dominus*, and to the Italian *ſignore*. But there is not any one word, either in French or in Engliſh, that will ſo generally anſwer. It may occaſionally be applied to a man in any ſtation, except the very loweſt, becauſe, to men of every other ſtation there are inferiors. It is always proper, as applied to God, to whom every creature is inferior. In the former of theſe applications, namely to man, it frequently correſponds, but not invariably, to the French *monſieur*, and to the Engliſh *ſir*, or *maſter*. In the application to God, it anſwers always to the French *ſeigneur* and to the Engliſh *lord*. There is a neceſſity, in theſe two languages, of changing the term, in compliance with the idiom of the tongue. *Domine* in Latin, and *ſignor* in Italian, in like manner as *kyrie* in Greek, and *adoni* in Hebrew, are equally ſuitable, in addreſſing God or man. But every body muſt be ſenſible, that this cannot be affirmed of the compellation of *monſieur* in French, or *ſir* in Engliſh.

§ 11. THERE is ſomething ſo peculiar in the Engliſh uſe of theſe familiar titles, that it may be proper to take particular notice of it, before I proceed to the application of them in tranſlating. In regard to the term *ſir*, the moſt common of all, let it be obſerved, firſt, that, in its ordinary acceptation, it is never uſed, except in the vocative anſwering to *kyrie* and *domine*; ſecondly, that it is never joined to the name of a perſon, neither to the Chriſtian name, nor to the ſurname. When the proper name is uſed, *maſter*, not *ſir*, muſt be prefixed. I ſay this of the word *ſir*, in its ordinary acceptation; for when it ſerves as the diſtinguiſhing title of knighthood, it is uſed in all the caſes, and is always prefixed to the Chriſtian name. But for this application there is no occaſion in tranſlating. The third thing I ſhall obſerve, on the ordinary acceptation of the word, is, that it never admits the article, either definite or indefinite. This, indeed, is a conſequence of its uſe being confined to the vocative. Laſtly, it has not a proper plural. The word *ſirs*, originally the plural, and equally reſpectful with the ſingular, is now rarely uſed. When it is uſed, it is with ſome difference in meaning. The compellation *ſir*, almoſt always ſhows reſpect; but *ſirs* ſhows a degree of familiarity hardly conſiſtent with reſpect. It is moſt commonly employed in ſpeaking to a crowd, or to inferiors. We uſually ſupply the plural of *ſir*, in our our addreſſes to others, by the word *gentlemen*. But this bears ſo ſtrong a ſignature of the diſtinctions which obtain in modern Europe, that it could not be uſed with propriety in the tranſlation of an ancient author.

Now, as to the title of *lord*, I have ſeveral peculiarities to obſerve. In the firſt place, when in the

* Matt. xxi. 30. † Gen. xxxi. 35. ‡ Gen. xxxii. 4, 5.

vocative, without either the poſſeſſive pronoun *my* prefixed, or any name or title annexed, the application is, invariably, according to the beſt uſe at preſent, to God or Chriſt. When it is addreſſed to men (now it is only to noblemen, and to perſons in certain eminent ſtations that uſe permits us to give it), it is always either preceded by the pronoun *my*, or followed by the title, or both. Thus, to ſay, *Lord*, or, *O Lord, help me!* is nowhere proper, but in an addreſs to God: whereas, *Help me, my Lord*, is proper only when ſpoken to a man. The diſtinction now taken notice of is, if I miſtake not, ſacredly obſerved in the common verſion of the Old Teſtament. There are two caſes, indeed, in which *my Lord*, in the vocative, is applied to God; but the intention, in both, is ſufficiently marked. In one caſe, whereof there occur a few examples, it is preceded by the interjection *O!* which adds ſolemnity to the invocation: *O! my Lord**. The other is, when it is coupled with *my God*, as in this †, *Awake to my judgment, my God, and my Lord.* Another thing to be remarked is, that when the term *lord* has the definite article prefixed, with no name, title, or deſcription ſubjoined, it is to be underſtood as ſpoken of God, or of Chriſt. When the word is applied to men, whether the article be, or be not, uſed, the name or title ſhould be annexed. If the frequent recurrence of the title render it proper to omit it, we muſt ſay, *my lord*, not *the lord*, acted thus; or we may ſay, *his lordſhip*, this laſt form being never uſed of a celeſtial ſuperior.

§ 12. So much for the words *ſir* and *lord*, as uſed by us at preſent. In regard to the term *maſter*, there can be no queſtion that it comes nearer the primitive ſignification of κυριος, than either of the former. Κυριος and δουλος are correlates in Greek, juſt as *maſter* and *ſervant* are in Engliſh. Indeed, *lord* and *ſervant* are thus uſed in the common verſion of the Goſpels, but not ſo properly. *Vaſſal*, not *ſervant*, is, in Engliſh, correlative to *lord* ‡. At leaſt, it was ſo anciently; for both were feudal terms, the latter denoting the proprietor of the land, the former the tenant, or him who held it under the proprietor. But, with the gradual abolition of feudal cuſtoms, the name *vaſſal* has gone almoſt into diſuſe; whereas, the import of the term *lord* has been greatly altered, in ſome reſpects extended, and in ſome reſpects limited. But ſuch variations are incident to every language. A remain of this uſage, however, we have ſtill in Scotland, in the meaning aſſigned to the word *laird*, which is no other than the old Scotch pronunciation of *lord*. In that dialect, it invariably denotes *landlord*, or, as Johnſon well explains it, *lord of the manor*. But to return: the reaſon why our tranſlators have choſen ſometimes to contraſt *ſervant* and *lord*, rather than *ſervant* and *maſter*, is becauſe they had preoccupied the word *maſter*, employing it to anſwer to διδασκαλος. This made it neceſſary to recur to ſome other term, to anſwer to κυριος, for which none fitter could be found than *lord*. I have thought it preferable to render διδασκαλος, more literally, *teacher*, and ſay §, *The diſciple is not above his teacher, nor the ſervan above his maſter.* That the motive of our tranſlators was preciſely what I have mentioned, is evident from this, that in the numerous paſſages in the Epiſtles, where the obſervance of the relative duties of maſters and ſervants is inculcated, the word κυριος, as well as δεσποτης, is always rendered *maſter*, and not *lord*. But there is an ambiguity, which ariſes from rendering διδασκαλος *maſter*, when the context does not point out what kind of maſter is meant. In the words of James ‖, Μη πολλοι διδασκαλοι γινεσθε, as expreſſed in the common tranſlation, *Be not many maſters*, hardly any of the unlearned ſuppoſe him to be ſpeaking of *teachers*.

§ 13. Now, let us conſider the ordinary method which our tranſlators have followed, in the hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt. One who reads the Bible with reflection (which not one of a thouſand does), is aſtoniſhed to find, that on the very firſt appearance of Jeſus Chriſt, as a teacher, though attended with no exterior marks of ſplendor and majeſty; though not acknowledged by the great and learned of the age; though meanly habited, in a garb not ſuperior to that of an ordinary artificer, in which capacity we have ground to believe he aſſiſted ¶ his ſuppoſed father in his earlier days; he is addreſſed by almoſt every body in the peculiar manner in which the Almighty is addreſſed in prayer. Thus the leper **, *Lord, if thou wilt, thou canſt make me clean.* Thus the centurion ††, *Lord, my ſervant lieth at home.* The Canaanitiſh woman crieth after him ‡‡, *Have mercy on me, O Lord.* He is likewiſe mentioned ſometimes under the ſimple appellation of *The Lord* §§, without any addition, a form of expreſſion which, in the Old Teſtament, our tranſlators, as above obſerved, had invariably appropriated to God. What is the meaning of this? Is it that, from his firſt ſhowing himſelf in public, all men believed him to be the Meſſiah; and not only ſo, but to be poſſeſſed of a divine nature, and entitled to be accoſted as God? Far from it. The utmoſt that can with truth be affirmed of the multitude, is, that they believed him to be a prophet. And even thoſe who, in proceſs of time, came to think him the Meſſiah, never formed

a

* Exod. iv. 10. 13. † Pſal. xxxv. 23. ‡ Blackſtone's Com. B. II. ch. 4. § Matth. x. 24. ‖ James, iii. 1.
¶ Mark, vi. 3. ** Matth. viii. 2. †† 6. ‡‡ Math. xv. 22. §§ John xx. 2.

a conception of any character, as belonging to that title, ſuperior to that of an earthly ſovereign, or of any nature ſuperior to the human. Nay, that the Apoſtles themſelves, before his reſurrection, had no higher notion, it were eaſy to prove. What then is the reaſon of this ſtrange peculiarity? Does the original give any handle for it? None in the leaſt. For, though the title that is given to him, is the ſame that is given to God, it is ſo far from being peculiarly ſo, as is the caſe with the Engliſh term ſo circumſtanced, that it is the common compellation of civility given not only to every ſtranger, but to almoſt every man of a decent appearance, by thoſe whoſe ſtation does not place them in an evident ſuperiority.

It is the title with which Mary Magdalene accoſted one whom ſhe ſuppoſed to be a gardener *. It is the title given by ſome Greek proſelytes to the Apoſtle Philip †, probably a fiſherman of Galilee. It is the title with which Paul the tentmaker, and Silas his companion, were ſaluted by the jailor at Thyatira ‡. Laſtly, it is the title with which Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator, a pagan and idolater, is addreſſed by the chief prieſts and Phariſees §. And though the Jewiſh rulers would not refuſe what was merely reſpectful to the Roman procurator, who as ſuch was their ſuperior, we may be ſure they would not have given him a title that could be underſtood to imply any thing ſacred or divine. Our tranſlators have been ſo ſenſible of this, that even in the application to the chief magiſtrate within the country, they have thought fit to render it only *ſir*. Further, it is the title which thoſe gave to Jeſus, who, at the time they gave it, knew nothing about him. In this manner, the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well addreſſed him ‖, when ſhe knew no more of him than that he was a Jew, which would not recommend him to her regard. Thus alſo he was addreſſed by the impotent man who lay near the pool of Bethesda ¶, who, as we learn from the ſequel of the ſtory, did not then know the perſon who converſed with him, and who ſoon proved his benefactor. In theſe places indeed, and ſome others which might be mentioned, our tranſlators have rendered the word κυριε, not *lord*, but *ſir*. Why they have not uniformly done ſo, when the term is given by contemporaries to Jeſus reſiding on the earth, it would be impoſſible to aſſign a good reaſon. The only reaſon I can imagine, is the uniform practice that obtains very properly amongſt his followers ſince his aſcenſion, now when all power in heaven and on earth is committed to him **, now when he is made head over all things unto his church ††, and hath received a name that is above every name ‡‡, that at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow of things in heaven, and things on the earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is LORD to the glory of God the Father: in one word, now when men are more eſpecially obliged to honour the Son even as they honour the Father §§.

Is there any fitneſs in thus exhibiting the honours of deity, as appropriated to him in the very time of his humiliation when, for our ſakes, he was pleaſed to veil his glory ‖‖, when he made himſelf of no reputation, diveſted himſelf, as the expreſſion ſtrictly implies, and took upon him the form of a ſervant? Or is there any conſiſtency in repreſenting men as uſing this ſtyle, whoſe ſentiments, on examination, will not ſupport it? The higheſt to which the faith of any of the people, not his diſciples, at that time roſe, was to think that he was ¶¶ John the Baptiſt riſen from the dead, Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets. But where do we find any of the Prophets addreſſed with that peculiarity of idiom, which commonly diſtinguiſhes the Deity? There is, therefore, in this manner of tranſlating a very great impropriety, firſt, as it produces an inconſiſtency between the ſtyle of the perſons introduced, and what from the hiſtory itſelf we diſcover of their ſentiments; ſecondly, as it thereby, to a mere Engliſh reader, throws a degree of incredibility on the whole narrative.

§ 14. If they had uniformly tranſlated the word κυριε *lord*, to whomſoever applied, they would have done better; becauſe every reader of common ſenſe muſt have perceived that the word was employed, not according to the Engliſh idiom, but according to the uſage of a tongue very different. Still, however, by comparing the various places where it occurs, it would have been practicable to reduce the term to its proper value. Not that I approve this ſervile manner of tranſlating, any more than that in the oppoſite extreme called liberal. To tranſlate the words, but not the idiom, is doing but half, and much the eaſier half, of the work of a tranſlator, and never fails to render obſcure and enigmatical in the tranſlation, what is perſpicuous and ſimple in the original. But our interpreters have, in this particular, followed neither the Hebrew idiom nor the Engliſh, but adopted a peculiarity in regard to Jeſus Chriſt, which repreſents moſt of his contemporaries, as entertaining the ſame opinions concerning him, which are now entertained among Chriſtians. Now, nothing can be more manifeſt than that in thoſe days, the ideas of his Apoſtles themſelves were far inferior to what we entertain.

To do juſtice, therefore, to our idiom, to preſerve at once conſiſtency, perſpicuity, and propriety, it is neceſſary that the word κυριος, in an addreſs to heaven, be rendered *Lord*, or *O Lord*; when the Supreme Being

* John, xx. 15. † John, xii. 21. ‡ Acts, xvi. 30. § Matth. xxvii. 63. ‖ John, iv. 11. ¶ John, v. 7.
** Matth. xxviii. 18. †† Eph. i. 22. ‡‡ Phil. ii. 9, &c. §§ John, v. 23. ‖‖ Phil. ii. 6. ¶¶ Matth. xvi. 13, &c.

ing is not addreſſed, but ſpoken of, *the Lord*; in addreſſing a king, or eminent magiſtrate, *my lord*; and in other ordinary caſes, *ſir*. Sometimes from a ſervant to his maſter, or from one in immediate ſubordination, to a perſon on whom he depends, it may be more emphatical to ſay *maſter*. Let it, however, be obſerved, that in tranſlating the Scripture, κυριος prefixed to a proper name, cannot be rendered either *ſir* or *maſter*, immediately followed by the name, on account of the particular idea which that mode of expreſſion conveys to us. Let it be alſo obſerved, that what I have ſaid of *kyrios*, as applied to Jeſus Chriſt, regards purely its application in the Goſpels. It is plain, that after Chriſt's aſcenſion into heaven, and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, he is viewed in a very different light. Addreſſes to him are conveyed only by prayer, and ought to be clothed in its language. When we ſpeak of him, it ought to be, not as of *a lord*, one poſſeſſed of great power and eminence, but as of *The Lord* of the creation, the heir of all things, to whom all authority in heaven and upon the earth, and all judgment, are committed by the Father. That expreſſion of Thomas, therefore, ὁ Κυριος μου και ὁ Θεος μου*, cannot be otherwiſe rendered than it has been rendered by our tranſlators, *My Lord and my God*. It is manifeſt, from the exclamation, that Thomas viewed his Maſter now ſince his reſurrection, though not yet aſcended, in a light in which he had never viewed him before. For theſe reaſons, I think that in general no alteration would be proper in the way of rendering the word κυριος as applied to Jeſus, either in the Acts or in the Epiſtles. The caſe is different in the Goſpels.

§ 15. It is proper to take notice, before I conclude this article, that the word κυριος is in the Septuagint alſo employed in tranſlating the Hebrew word יהוה *Jehovah*, the incommunicable name of God. Though this is a proper name, and not an appellative, the Seventy, probably from the ſuperſtitious opinion which had ariſen among the Jews (for it was evidently not from the beginning), that it was dangerous to pronounce that word, and conſequently to adopt it into another language, have thought fit to render it always κυριος, an appellative, which, as we have ſeen, is of very extenſive application. Nay, in reading the Hebrew Scriptures in the ſynagogue ſervice, their their doctors to this day always read *adon*, or *adoni*, *Lord*, or *my Lord*, where they find Jehovah. The writers of the New Teſtament, who wrote in Greek, have ſo far conformed to the uſage of their countrymen, that they have never introduced this name in their writings. In quoting from the Old Teſtament, they have adopted the method of the Seventy, whoſe words they frequently uſe. The generality of Chriſtian tranſlators have in this imitated their practice. Our own, in particular, have only in four places of the Old Teſtament uſed the name *Jehovah*. In all other places, which are almoſt innumerable, they render it *the Lord*. But for diſtinction's ſake, when this word correſponds to *Jehovah*, it is printed in capitals.

I once thought, that in tranſlating the New Teſtament, the word *Jehovah* might properly be replaced, wherever, in a quotation from the Old, that name was uſed in the Hebrew. On more mature reflection I now think differently. It ſeemed good to infinite wiſdom, in the old diſpenſation, when a peculiar nation was choſen, and contradiſtinguiſhed to all others, ſo far to condeſcend to the weakneſs of his creatures, as to diſtinguiſh himſelf as their God, by an appropriated name, which might diſcriminate him with them from the gods of the nations; the general names *God* and *Lord* being applied to them all. But, in the Goſpel Diſpenſation, wherein all ſuch diſtinctions were to be aboliſhed, it was proper that there ſhould remain nothing which might appear to repreſent God as a national or local deity. A proper name is not neceſſary where there are no more than one of a kind. We are not ſenſible of the want of a proper name for the ſun, the moon, or the earth. It is not ſuitable in the interpreter of of the New Teſtament, to ſhow a greater nicety of diſtinction than the ſacred penmen have warranted. It belongs rather to the annotator, than to the tranſlator, to mark ſuch differences. In tranſlating the Old Teſtament, the diſtinction, in my judgment, ought to be ſacredly preſerved, for the very ſame reaſon that no diſtinction ought to be made, in the New. The tranſlator ought faithfully to repreſent his original, as far as the language which he writes is capable of doing it. So much for the import of the word κυριος, and the different ſenſes that it bears, according to the application.

PART

* John xx. 28.

PART II.

Διδασκαλος, *Rabbi*.

I PURPOSE now to make a few obſervations on the word διδασκαλος, and ſome other titles of reſpect current in Judea in the days of our Saviour. After the Babyloniſh captivity, when Jeruſalem and the temple were rebuilt, and the people reſtored to their ancient poſſeſſions, care was taken, under the conduct of Ezra, and thoſe who ſucceeded him in the adminiſtration of affairs, to prevent their relapſing into idolatry, which had brought ſuch accumulated calamities on their country. It was juſtly conſidered as one of the beſt expedients for anſwering this end, as we learn partly from Scripture, and partly from Jewiſh writers, to promote amongſt all ranks the knowledge of God and of his law, and to excite the whole people throughout the land to join regularly in the public worſhip of the only true God. For their accommodation, ſynagogues came, in proceſs of time, to be erected in every city and village where a ſufficient number of people could be found to make a congregation. Every ſynagogue had its ſtated governors and preſident, that the public ſervice might be decently conducted, and that the people might be inſtructed in the ſacred writings, both the law and the prophets. The ſynagogues were fitted for anſwering among them the like purpoſes with pariſh-churches amongſt us Chriſtians. But this was not all. That the ſynagogues might be provided with knowing paſtors and wiſe rulers, it was neceſſary that there ſhould alſo be public ſeminaries or ſchools, wherein thoſe who were deſtined to teach others, were to be taught themſelves. And ſo great was their veneration for theſe ſchools or colleges, that they accounted them more ſacred than even ſynagogues, and next, in this reſpect, to the temple. They maintained that a ſynagogue might lawfully be converted into a ſchool, but not a ſchool into a ſynagogue. The former was aſcending, the latter deſcending. Both were devoted to the ſervice of God; but the ſynagogue, ſay they, is for the ſpiritual nouriſhment of the ſheep, the ſchool for that of the ſhepherds.

§ 2. Now their ſchools were properly what we ſhould call divinity colleges; for in them they were inſtructed in the ſacred language, the ancient Hebrew, not then the language of the country, in the law and the traditions, the writings of the Prophets, the holy ceremonies, the ſtatutes, cuſtoms, and procedure of their judicatories; in a word, in whatever concernd the civil conſtitution and religion of their country. I make this diſtinction, of civil and religious, more in conformity to modern and Chriſtian notions, than in reference to ancient and Jewiſh. In that polity, theſe were ſo interwoven, or rather blended, as to be inſeparable. Their law was their religion, and their religion was their law; inſomuch that with them there was a perfect coincidence in the profeſſions of lawyer and divine. But as to their mode of education, that they had ſome kind of ſchools long before the time above mentioned, even from the beginning of their eſtabliſhment, under Joſhua, in the land of Canaan, or, at leaſt, from the time of Samuel, can hardly be made a queſtion. A certain progreſs in letters had been made very early by this people, and regularly tranſmitted from one generation to another. But this ſeems evidently to have been without ſuch fixed ſeminaries as were erected and endowed afterwards; elſe it is impoſſible there ſhould be ſo little notice of them in ſo long a tract of time, of which, as far as religion is concerned, we have a hiſtory pretty particular. All that appears before the captivity, on this ſubject, is, that numbers of young men were wont, for the ſake of inſtruction, to attend the moſt eminent Prophets, and were therefore called the ſons, that is, the diſciples, of the Prophets, and that, in this manner, were conſtituted a ſort of ambulatory ſchools, for communicating the knowledge of letters, and of the law. In theſe were probably taught the elements of the Hebrew muſic and verſification. We are informed, alſo*, that Jehoſhaphat, king of Judah, ſent Prieſts, Levites, and others, to teach in all the cities of Judah. But this appears to have been merely a temporary meaſure, adopted by that pious monarch for the inſtruction of the people in his own time, and not an eſtabliſhment, which ſecured a ſucceſſion and continuance. Now, this is quite different from the erection that obtained afterwards in their cities, of a ſort of permanent academies, for the education of youth deſtined for the upper ſtations in ſociety.

§ 3. FURTHER, to give the greater luſtre to thoſe ſeminaries, they were commonly men of note, in reſpect of their ſtation and quality, as well as diſtinguiſhed

* 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8, 9.

ed for their learning, who were appointed to preſide and teach in them. Theſe were moſtly Prieſts and Levites; but not entirely; for eminent perſons, from other tribes, were alſo admitted to ſhare in this honour. No ſooner did erudition become an object of national attention in Judea; no ſooner were endowments made for advancing and promoting it, than the emulation of literary men was excited to attain the honours peculiar to the profeſſion, by having the direction, or a principal part in the teaching, in ſome noted ſchool. Even a certificate, from the perſons qualified, of being equal to the charge, was not a little prized. Though, at firſt ſight, it may appear but a ſmall circumſtance, it will be admitted, by the judicious, to be a conſiderable evidence that, in our Saviour's time, learning was in general and high eſteem among the Jews, to find that thoſe titles which related to the buſineſs of teaching, were, with ſo much ſolicitude, courted, and with ſo much oſtentation diſplayed, by perſons of diſtinction. Of this kind, the honorary titles, *father*, *rabbi*, *doctor*, or *teacher*, *guide*, or *conductor*, the name *ſcribe*, often indeed a name of office, *lawyer*, *doctor of law*, may juſtly be accounted. I do not, however, mean to affirm, that all theſe titles are of different import. Some of them, as will ſoon appear, are juſtly held ſynonymous.

§ 4. Some of theſe had come into uſe but a little before our Saviour's time. This was the caſe, in particular, of that moſt celebrated title *rabbi*, or as for ſome time it ſeems to have been diſtinguiſhed into *rab*, and *rabban*, with ſome difference of ſignification. In the Old Teſtament, we find the term רב *rab*, in compoſition with ſome other word, employed as a name of office and dignity, but not till the people became acquainted with the Chaldeans, concerning whom only it is uſed. The word, both in Hebrew and in Chaldee, ſignifies ſometimes *great*, ſometimes *many*, and, when uſed ſubſtantively, denotes one who is at the head of any buſineſs, of whatever kind it be. Thus, רב ההבל *rab hachebel**, is, in the Septuagint πρωτευς, רב טבחים *rab tebachim*†, αρχιμαγειρος, *chief cook*. The word will bear this verſion, but it does not ſuit the context in the paſſage where it is found, and רב סריסים *rab ſeriſim*‡, αρχιευνουχος, the firſt rendered, in the Engliſh verſion, *ſhipmaſter*, the ſecond, *captain of the guard*, and the third, *maſter of the eunuchs*. It is uſed in the plural alſo for *chief men* in general, ſuperintendents, or thoſe at the head of affairs. Thus, רבי המלך *rabbe hammelech*§, are the chief men employed by the king over the different departments of the ſtate. It is rendered *the princes of the king* in the common tranſlation. The original term ſuits entirely the import of the Latin word *princeps*, but not of the Engliſh word *prince*, at leaſt in its moſt common acceptation: for it is not the king's ſons, or any order of nobles, who are ſo denominated. The word, among the Chaldeans, appears evidently to have been equivalent to the term שר *ſhar* among the Hebrews. Accordingly, he who is ſtyled by Daniel, in the paſſage above quoted, רב סריסים, is four times, in the ſame chapter, called שר סרהימים *ſhar haſeriſim*‖. And this uſe of the name *rab* ſeems to have continued long in Syria, as well as in Chaldea. Thus, in the Syriac New Teſtament, it is found, in the ſame manner, united with the common appellation of any ſort of officer, in order to denote the principal perſon in that office. Thus, *rab-cohana* ¶ is the high-prieſt, *rab-machſa* is chief of the publicans **, and *rab-raghotha* †† is chief ſhepherd. *Rab*, conſtrued in this manner, is equivalent to the Greek αρχι, as uſed in compoſition. The preceding titles are accordingly thus expreſſed in Greek, αρχιερευς, αρχιτελωνης, and αρχιποιμην.

Again, the word *rab* is ſometimes found in that verſion, combined, not with the title of any ſort of officer, but with a term denoting the office or charge itſelf; in which caſe it always means the perſon who is principally entruſted with the buſineſs. Thus, *rab-beth* ‡‡ is the ſteward, επιτροπος, he who is over the houſehold; and *rab-canoſhetha* §§ is the ruler of the ſynagogue, αρχισυναγωγος. It is not unlikely, though I do not find any example of it in Scripture, that the term has at firſt been ſimilarly compounded with ſome word ſignifying a ſchool, or, perhaps, with the name of the art or ſcience taught, in order to denote the overſeer of ſuch a ſeminary, or the teacher of ſuch an art. This hypotheſis is at leaſt favoured by analogy. As uſe, however, is variable, it appears, from what has actually happened, extremely probable, that when all other applications of the term have been dropped, it has ſtill remained as an honourable compellation of the learned. And when the term *rab* came to be peculiarly applied to ſuch, the word wherewith it was, at firſt, for diſtinction's ſake, compounded, would be ſuperſeded as unneceſſary.

It is, at leaſt, certain, that the Jewiſh doctors, who reſided at Babylon, about the time of our Saviour, were called ſimply *rab*. But, in the Old Teſtament there is no trace of ſuch a title as *rab*, *rabbi*, or *rabban*, given to a man of letters; nor is any of the old Prophets, or Scribes, or, indeed, any other perſon, diſtinguiſhed by this mark of reſpect prefixed to his name. Though the introduction of titles is always occaſioned by the erection of uſeful and important offices,

* Jonah, i. 6. † Jer. xxxix. 11. ‡ Dan. i. 3. § Jer. xxxix. 13. ‖ Dan. i. 7, 8, 9, 18.
¶ Matth. xxv. 51. ** Luke, xix, 2. †† 1 Pet. v. 4. ‡‡ Matth. xx. 8. §§ Mark, v. 35.

fices, it is commonly in the decline of merit that pompous titles are moſt affected. At firſt, no doubt, vain-glory has led many to aſſume them, to whom they did not belong, in right of office, and an intereſted adulation has induced others to give them. Some of them, however, came ſoon, among the Jews, to be converted into a kind of academical diſtinctions, which, to give them more weight, are ſaid to have been conferred ſolemnly in their ſchools or colleges, accompanied with certain religious ceremonies. From this practice, I may obſerve by the way, ſprang literary degrees in Chriſtian univerſities, to which there is nothing ſimilar in all Pagan antiquity, either Greek or Roman, but to which the Jewiſh cuſtom above mentioned bears an evident and cloſe analogy.

§ 5. THOSE who belonged to the ſchool were divided into three claſſes or orders. The loweſt was that of the diſciples, or learners; the ſecond, that of the fellows, or companions, thoſe who, having made conſiderable progreſs in learning, were occaſionally employed by the maſters, in teaching the younger ſtudents. The higheſt was that of the preceptors, or teachers, to whom they appropriated the reſpectful title of *doctor* or *rabbi*, which differs from *rab* only by the addition of the affix pronoun of the firſt perſon. All belonging to the ſchool were accounted honourable, in a certain degree. Even the loweſt, the name *diſciple*, was conſidered as redounding to the honour of thoſe youths, who were ſelected from the multitude, had the advantage of a learned education, and by their diligence and progreſs, gave hopes that they would, one day, fill with credit the moſt important ſtations. The title *companion*, *fellow*, or *aſſociate*, was conſidered as very honourable to the young graduate who obtained it, being a public teſtimony of the proficiency he had made in his ſtudies. And the title *rabbi* was their higheſt academical honour. That it was only the youth, in what are called the genteeler ſtations, who had the advantage of a learned education, is manifeſt from the contempt which our Lord's parentage drew on him, as a teacher, from his fellow-citizens. *Whence*, ſay they *, *hath this man this wiſdom? Is not this the carpenter's ſon?* They conclude that he muſt be illiterate, from the mean condition of his parents. It was not the children of ſuch then, we may reaſonably infer, who were trained in thoſe ſeminaries.

In the Goſpels, διδασκαλος is given as the Greek tranſlation of the Syriac *rabbi* †. Yet this word does not, as the Greek, literally ſignify *teacher*; but, having been conferred, at firſt, as a mark of reſpect on actual teachers, and afterwards on other learned men, διδασκαλος was juſtly accounted as appoſite a verſion as the Greek language afforded. It is certain, the term *rabbi* began ſoon to be uſed with great latitude. But though it came gradually to be beſtowed on thoſe who were not actual teachers, it always retained, ever ſince it had been appropriated to the learned, a relation to learning; and, being underſtood as an addition due only to literary merit, it ſtill denoted, that though the perſon who enjoyed it, might not be actually employed in teaching, he was well qualified for the office. *Rabban* is not the name of a degree ſuperior to *rabbi*, though it ſeems intended for heightening the ſignification. It may be underſtood to denote eminent or learned rabbi, and appears to have been but very ſeldom uſed. The title *rabboni*, which we find twice given to our Lord, is *rabban*, with the addition of the affix of the firſt perſon, and accommodated to the pronunciation of Judea. One of thoſe who addreſſed him with this compellation, was blind Bartimeus, when he applied for the recovery of his ſight ‡. The other was Mary Magdalene, when ſhe firſt ſaw Jeſus after his reſurrection §.

That the uſe of the term *rabban* has not extended far beyond Paleſtine, may be preſumed from the following circumſtance. Though the word *rabbi* is very common in the Syriac tranſlation, the Greek διδασκαλε being generally ſo rendered; yet in the only place where that tranſlator introduces the word *rabboni*, which is that quoted from John, he prefixes *in Hebrew*, that is, in the dialect of Paleſtine, which was then ſo called, adding the explanation given by the Evangeliſt, *that is, teacher*; which plainly ſhows that the word *rabboni* was not Syriac. This is the more remarkable, as in the other paſſage, where the hiſtorian interprets in the ſame manner, the word *rabbi*, adding ‖ ὁ λεγεται ἑρμηνευομενον διδασκαλε, that interpreter omits this explanatory clauſe as intended only for the Grecian reader, and of no uſe to thoſe who underſtood Syriac. In the paſſage in Mark, where *rabboni* occurs, as the Evangeliſt had added no explanation, his interpreter has not thought it neceſſary to change their own word *rabbi*. This is an evidence that he alſo conſidered the difference in ſignification between the two words as inconſiderable. Another ſtrong preſumption of the ſame point is, that the Apoſtle John explains both by the ſame Greek word.

It may be obſerved here by the way, that they likewiſe uſed to raiſe the import of a title by doubling it. Thus our Lord, ſpeaking of the Phariſees, ſays, They love to be called of men *rabbi, rabbi* ¶. In this

* Matth. xiii. 54, 55. † John i. 38. ‡ Mark x. 51. § John xx. 16. ‖ John i. 38. ¶ Matth. xxiii. 7.

manner he was himſelf addreſſed by Judas at the time when that diſciple choſe to aſſume the appearance of more than ordinary regard *. The title κυριε ſeems to have been uſed in the ſame manner. Not every one who ſaith unto me *Lord, Lord*, κυριε, κυριε†. This is very agreeable to the genius of the Oriental tongues, which often, by the repetition of an adjective, expreſs the ſuperlative degree.

§ 6. I took notice once before that, in the common verſion of the Goſpels, διδασκαλος is generally rendered *maſter*. I cannot ſay that the word is miſtranſlated when ſo rendered, ſince it is the moſt common title with us, wherewith ſcholars addreſs their teacher. But it is rather too indefinite, as this term does not diſtinguiſh the relation meant from almoſt any other relation, wherein ſuperior and inferior are brought together. The word *maſter* ſerves equally for rendering κυριος, δεσποτης επισατης, καθηγητης, as for διδασκαλος. And therefore, in many caſes, eſpecially where the context requires a contradiſtinction to any of thoſe terms, the word *maſter* is not proper. It is indeed evident to me, that in the ordinary Helleniſtic uſe, it correſponds nearly to the Engliſh word *doctor*. Both are honorary titles, expreſſive of the qualifications of the perſon to whom they are given. Both are literary titles that relate to no other ſort of merit but learning; and both are ſolemnly conferred with certain ceremonies, which we call *graduation*, by thoſe who are accounted the proper judges. Our tranſlators have, in one place, very properly rendered it *doctor*. Joſeph and Mary, we are told ‡, found Jeſus in the temple ſitting *in the midſt of the doctors*, εν μεσω των διδασκαλων. To have ſaid, in the midſt of the maſters, would have been a very vague expreſſion of the ſenſe. Nor have we reaſon to believe that it would have been proper here to tranſlate the word *teachers*, as it did not imply that they were ſuch by profeſſion. In compoſition, our interpreters have commonly rendered it *doctors* §. *There were Phariſees and* νομοδιδασκαλοι, *doctors of the law ſitting by*. Again ‖, *There ſtood up one of the council, a Phariſee named Gamaliel*, νομοδιδασκαλος, *a doctor of law*. Beſides, we are accuſtomed to hear the words *Jewiſh rabbies* and *Jewiſh doctors* uſed ſynonymouſly. In Juſtin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew, the rabbies are always called διδασκαλοι.

§ 7. But it may be objected that this does not account for the application of the title to our Lord. As he did not derive his doctrine from any of thoſe learned ſeminaries, frequented by ſuch of the youth as were reckoned the flower of the nation, the name *doctor* could not, with propriety, be applied to him. In anſwer to this, let it be obſerved, firſt, that as in Judea at that time they ſpoke not Greek, but a dialect of Chaldee, not differing conſiderably from what is called Syriac, it is evident that the actual compellation, whereby our Saviour was addreſſed, was *rabbi*. For this we have the expreſs teſtimony of the Apoſtle John, in a paſſage lately quoted, who, though writing in a different tongue, thought proper to mention the title uſually given him in the language of the country, adding, merely for the ſake of thoſe readers who knew nothing of the Oriental languages, that it is equivalent to the Greek διδασκαλε. Now, as the Chaldaic word does not literally ſignify *teacher*, which the Greek word does, their equivalence muſt ariſe ſolely from the ordinary application of them as titles of reſpect to men of learning; and in this view the Engliſh word *doctor* is adapted equally to the tranſlation of both.

Secondly, though the title *rabbi* could regularly be conferred only by thoſe who had the ſuperintendency of their ſchools, we have ground to believe that with them, as with us, the people would be ready to give the compellation through courteſy, and on the preſumption that it had been conferred, wherever they ſaw or ſuppoſed diſtinguiſhed abilities in learning: and this is moſt probably the reaſon why we find it given alſo to John the Baptiſt ¶.

Thirdly, in the Jewiſh ſtate, a divine commiſſion was conceived to confer all ſorts of dignities and honours, in an eminent manner, and ſo ſuperſeded ordinary rules, and human deſtinations. On this account they conſidered a prophet, though not of the ſacerdotal family, as an extraordinary prieſt, and entitled to offer ſacrifice, in conſideration of the evidences he gave of his miſſion. Thus the Prophets Samuel ** and Elijah †† (neither of whom was a prieſt) offered ſacrifice with acceptance, and upon altars too not warranted by the law. It is evident that ſome of thoſe who gave the title of *rabbi* to our Saviour, were willing, either ſincerely or pretendedly, thus to account for their doing ſo. *Rabbi*, ſaid Nicodemus, a Phariſee, and a member of the Sanhedrim ‡‡, *we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do theſe miracles that thou doſt, except God be with him*. Here he, as it were, aſſigns the reaſon why he ſaluted him *rabbi*, although he knew that he had not been educated in human literature, and had not received from men any literary honours. The ſame title was given him alſo by others of that ſect inſidiouſly, when, though they pretended friendſhip, their aim

* Mark xiv. 45. † Matth. vii. 21. ‡ Luke ii. 46. § Luke v. 17. ‖ Acts v. 34.
¶ John iii. 26. ** 1 Sam. vii. 9. †† 1 Kings xviii. 31, &c. ‡‡ John iii. 1, &c.

aim was to entangle him in his talk, that they might have a pretext for delivering him up to the Roman governor. In other cases, they show sufficiently how little they were disposed to admit his right to any degree of respect arising from knowledge. They said *, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?* A charge, the truth of which our Lord very readily admitted by replying, *My doctrine is not mine, but his who sent me.*

§ 8. Now, from the foregoing observations, it appears that the name διδασκαλος, as being nearly equivalent in import to the appellation *rabbi*, for which it has been substituted by the Evangelist, may be fitly expressed, either by the English term *doctor*, or by the Syriac *rabbi*, which is now so much naturalized amongst us, that its meaning, as a Jewish title of literary honour, can hardly be mistaken. In the addresses made to our Lord in his lifetime, the Syriac term is surely preferable; the English word, though very apposite in respect of its origin, and ordinary acceptation, has considerably sunk in its value, in consequence of the slight manner wherein we are accustomed to hear it applied. But we all know that *rabbi* among the Jews of that age was a title in the highest degree respectful, and on that account interdicted by their Master, even to the Apostles themselves. It is also the word by which διδασκαλος is commonly rendered in the Syriac version of the New Testament, justly held the most respectable of all the translations extant, as being both the oldest, and written in a language not materially different from that spoken by our Lord and his Apostles. The difference appears not to be greater (if so great) than that which we observe between the Attic and the Ionic dialects in Greek. But when διδασκαλος is construed with other words, which either limit or appropriate it, we commonly judge it better to render it *teacher*, according to the simple and primitive signification of the word. In such cases it is probable, that the writer alludes merely to what is usually implied in the Greek term. So much for the import of *rabbi* or διδασκαλος in the New Testament.

§ 9. Now, when we compare the titles *kyrios* and *didascalos* together, in respect of the Jewish use and application of them, we find several remarkable differences between them. From our modes of thinking we should be apt to conclude, that the former of these appellations would be much the more honourable of the two. Yet this is far from holding generally, though, in particular cases, it no doubt does. In regard to the term *kyrios*, I observed formerly, that as it originally signified *master*, as opposed to *servant*, it retained in that nation, in our Saviour's time, so much of its primitive meaning, as to be always understood to imply an acknowledged inferiority in the person who gave it, to him to whom it was given. Civility might lead a man to give it to his equal. But to give it to one who, either in the order of nature, or by human conventions, was considered as inferior and subordinate, would have looked more like an insult than like a compliment. Hence it must be regarded as a term purely relative, which derived its value solely from the dignity of the person who seriously bestowed it. To be entitled to this compellation from a monarch neither tributary nor dependent, denoted him who received it to be superior to human. But no useful citizen was so low as not to be entitled to this mark of respect from a common beggar. And, as its value in every instance depended solely on the dignity of the giver, it might be either the most honourable title that could be conferred, or the most insignificant. The use of the title *rabbi*, *didascalos*, or doctor, was, in this respect, totally different. As it was understood to express not relation, but certain permament qualifications in the person who received it, they did not consider it as a matter of courtesy, but as a matter of right. It was not relative but absolute. The same person did not (as was the case of *kyrios*) consider himself as obliged to give it to one, and entitled to receive it from another. Whoever had this literary degree conferred on him, was entitled to receive the the honourable compellation equally from all persons, superiors, inferiors, and equals. And we need not doubt that this vainglorious race would brand with the ignominious character of rusticity all who withheld it.

§ 10. Hence we may discover the reason why our Lord, when warning his disciples * against imitating the ostentation and presumption of the Scribes and Pharisees, in affecting to be denominated *rabbi*, father, guide, or conductor, does not once mention *kyrios*, though, of all titles of respect, the most common. It is manifest that his view was not to prohibit them from giving or receiving the common marks of civility, but to check them from arrogating what might seem to imply a superiority in wisdom and understanding over others, and a title to dictate to their fellows, a species of arrogance which appeared but too plainly in the Scribes and learned men of those days. As to the title *kyrios*, he knew well that from their wordly situation and circumstances (which in this matter were the only rule), they could expect it from none but those in the lowest ranks, who would as readily give it to an artisan or a peasant, and that therefore there could be no danger of vanity from this quarter. But the case was different with titles expressive not of fleeting relations, but of those important

* John vii. 15.

† Matth. xxiii. 7, &c.

ant qualifications which denote a fitneſs for being the lights and conductors of the human race. The title *father*, in the ſpiritual or metaphoric ſenſe, the moſt reſpectful of all, he prohibits his diſciples from either aſſuming or giving, chuſing that it ſhould be appropriated to God, and at the ſame time claims the title of guide and ſpiritual inſtructor to himſelf.

§ 11. Nor let it be imagined that the title διδασκαλοι, beſtowed on the firſt miniſters of the religion of Chriſt, ſtands in oppoſition to the admonitions here given. The word, it muſt be owned, is equivocal, but is every where eaſily diſtinguiſhed by the connection; for when it is applied to ſuch as are literally employed in teaching, it muſt not be underſtood as a complimental title anſwering to the Chaldaic word, *rabbi*, but as a name of office correſponding to the Hebrew word מלמד *melammed, teacher, preceptor*. Beſides, when applied even to the Apoſtles, it is to be underſtood in a ſubordinate ſenſe. They are in like manner called *ſhepherds*, but ſtill in ſubordination to him who is the *chief Shepherd*, as well as the *chief Teacher* in his church. Chriſt is called the only foundation, *for other foundation*, ſays Paul *, *can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*. Yet the ſame Apoſtle does not heſitate to repreſent the church† as *built on the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*. Nor does he conſider his ſtyling himſelf the father of thoſe in whoſe converſion he had been inſtrumental, as either incompatible with, or derogatory from, the honour of him who alone is our Father, and who is in heaven. When his meaning is ſo evident, no miſtake can ariſe from the word. *It is the ſpirit that quickeneth*, ſaid our Lord‡, *the fleſh profiteth nothing; the words that I ſpeak unto you, they are ſpirit, and they are life*. Now the ſpirit of the precept is tranſgreſſed, when his miniſters claim an undue ſuperiority over their Lord's heritage, arrogating to themſelves a dominion over the faith of his diſciples; and when, in conſequence of an undue attachment to wordly honours, or to the power that is underſtood to accompany theſe, men become ſolicitous of being diſtinguiſhed from their equals, either by external marks of homage, or by an implicit deference and ſubmiſſion in point of judgment. With this character Diotrephes § ſeems to have been charged, whom the Apoſtle John denominates φιλοπρωτευων, one who loves pre-eminence, a character which, not many ages after, became too general in the church.

§ 12. It was not, therefore, ſo much the titles, as that ſort of authority which was underſtood, among the Jews, to be conveyed under them, that was our Saviour's object in thoſe admonitions. Indeed a fondneſs for title, a ſolicitude about precedency, or an affectation of being diſtinguiſhed by ſuch outward marks of reverence, are evidently condemned by him as a kind of earthly ambition unbecoming the meekneſs and humility of his diſciples, and that unremitted deference to the divine authority, which they ought ever to maintain. The practice of the Apoſtles, and indeed, the whole tenor of the New Teſtament, ſupply us with this commentary on the words. Whereas the cuſtomary marks of mere civil reſpect, ſo far from being condemned in Scripture, are always uſed by the inſpired penmen themſelves, when there is a proper occaſion of giving them.

§ 13. So much for the import of the principal titles of honour which occur in the New Teſtament, and the difference, in reſpect of application, between them and thoſe commonly ſuppoſed to correſpond to them amongſt us.

* 1 Cor. iii. 11. † Eph. ii. 24. ‡ John, vi. 63. § 3 John, 9.

DISSERTA-

DISSERTATION THE EIGHTH.

Obſervations on the Manner of rendering ſome Words, to which there are not any that perfectly correſpond in modern Languages.

IT was obſerved, in a former Diſſertation *, that there are words in the language of every people, which are not capable of being tranſlated into that of any other people who have not a perfect conformity with them in thoſe cuſtoms or ſentiments which have given riſe to thoſe words. The terms comprehended under this remark may be diſtributed into three claſſes. The firſt is of weights, meaſures, and coins; the ſecond of rites, ſects, and feſtivals: the third of dreſs, judicatories, and offices.

PART I.

Weights, Meaſures, and Coins.

AS to the firſt claſs, it is evident that there is nothing wherein nations, eſpecially ſuch as are diſtant from one another in time and place, more frequently differ than in the meaſures and coins, which law or cuſtom has eſtabliſhed among them. Under coins I ſhall here include weights: becauſe it was chiefly by weight that money was anciently diſtinguiſhed. As commonly every people have names only for their own, it is often neceſſary, in the tranſlation of ancient and foreign books, to adopt their peculiar names, and by mentioning in the margin the equivalent in our own money, meaſures, and weights, to ſupply the reader with the proper information. This method has accordingly been, often, though not always, taken by the tranſlators of holy writ. Into the common verſion of the Old Teſtament, ſeveral Oriental, and other foreign names, have been admitted, which are explained in the margin. Hence we have *ſhekel*, *ephah*, *bath*, *homer*, *cor*, and ſome others. This, however, (for what reaſon I know not), has not been attempted in the New Teſtament. Inſtead of it, one or other of theſe two methods has been taken: either ſome name of our own, ſuppoſed to be equivalent, or at leaſt not ſtrictly confined, by uſe, to a preciſe meaning, is adopted, ſuch as *pound*, *penny*, *farthing*, *buſhel*, *firkin*; or (which is the only other method ever uſed by our tranſlators) ſome general expreſſion is employed; as, *a piece of money*, *a piece of ſilver*, *tribute money*, *a meaſure*, and the like. Theſe are three ways, every one of which has ſome advantages, and ſome diſadvantages, and is, in ſome caſes, the moſt eligible method, but not in others.

One *Monſieur le Cene*, a French writer, who, in the end of the laſt century, wrote what he called, a Project for a new tranſlation of the Bible into French, has recommended a fourth method, which is, to give in the verſion the exact value expreſſed in the money, or meaſures, of the country into whoſe language the verſion is

* Diſſ. II. P. I. § 5.

is made. The anonymous author of an Eſſay, in Engliſh, for a new tranſlation, has adopted this idea; or rather, without naming *Le Cene*, has turned into Engliſh, and transferred to our uſe, all thoſe remarks of the Frenchman, which he accounted applicable to the Engliſh verſion. This fourth method, though much approved by ſome, on account of its ſuppoſed perſpicuity, is, in my judgment, the worſt of them all, nor do I know a ſingle inſtance wherein I could ſay that it ought to be adopted *.

§ 2. But, before I enter on the diſcuſſion of theſe methods, it is proper here to premiſe, that as to meaſures, the inquiry may well be confined to thoſe called meaſures of capacity. The ſmaller length meaſures have originally, in every country, been borrowed from ſome of the proportions which take place in the human body. Hence *inch*, *handbreadth*, *ſpan*, *foot*, *cubit*. The larger meaſures, *pace*, *furlong*, *mile*, are but multiples of the leſs. Now, as there is not an exact uniformity of meaſure in the parts of individuals, it would naturally follow, that different nations would eſtabliſh, for themſelves, ſtandard-meaſures, not much different from thoſe of others, nor yet entirely the ſame. And this is what, in ſuch meaſures, has actually happened. When any of them, therefore, is mentioned, we know the meaſure nearly, but cannot know it accurately, till we are informed of what nation it is the inch, ſpan, foot, cubit, &c. The names have, by uſe, acquired a latitude and currency in theſe different applications. As to ſuperficial meaſure, we know it is reckoned no otherwiſe than by the ſquare of the long meaſure. Whereas, the cubical form, not anſwering ſo well in practice to the menſuration of ſolids, the ſtandards for them have generally been fixed without any regard to meaſures of length or ſurface. It is with theſe alone therefore that we are here concerned.

§ 3. Now, the beſt way of determining our choice properly, among the different methods of tranſlating above mentioned, is by attending to the ſcope of the paſſages wherein the mention of money and meaſures is introduced. Firſt, then, it ſometimes happens, that accuracy, in regard to the value of theſe, is of importance to the ſenſe. Secondly, it ſometimes happens, that the value of the coin, or the capacity of the meaſure, is of no conſequence to the import of the paſſage. Thirdly, it happens alſo, ſometimes, that though the real value of the coin, or the capacity of the meaſure, does not affect the ſenſe of the paſſage, the comparative value of the different articles mentioned, is of ſome moment for the better underſtanding of what is ſaid. Let us conſider what methods ſuit beſt the ſeveral caſes now mentioned.

§ 4. First, I obſerved, that accuracy in regard to the value of the meaſures or coins mentioned, is ſometimes of importance to the ſenſe. When this is the caſe, and when we have no word exactly correſponding in import to the original term, that term ought to be retained in the verſion, and explained in the margin, according to the firſt method taken notice of. An inſtance, where the knowledge both of the capacity of the meaſure and of the value of the coin, are eſſential to the ſenſe, we have, in that public cry, χοινιξ σιτου δηναριου†, which our tranſlators render, *a meaſure of wheat for a penny*. It is evidently the intention of the writer to inform us of the rate of this neceſſary article, as a characteriſtic of the time whereof he is ſpeaking. But our verſion not only gives no information on this head, but has not even the appearance of giving any, which the word *chœnix* would have had, even to thoſe who did not underſtand it. But to ſay *a meaſure*, without ſaying what meaſure, is to ſay juſt nothing at all. The word *penny*, here, is alſo exceptionable, being uſed indefinitely, inſomuch that the amount of the declaration is, *a certain quantity of wheat for a certain quantity of money*. This ſuggeſts no idea of either dearth or plenty; and can be characteriſtical of no time, as it holds equally of every time. In this caſe, the original term, notwithſtanding its harſhneſs, ought to be retained in the text, and explained in the margin. Again, it was, doubtleſs the intention of the ſacred penman, to acquaint us at how low a price our Saviour was ſold by his treacherous diſciple, when he informs us‡, that the chief prieſts agreed to give Judas τριακοντα αργυρια. In like manner, when the Evangeliſt mentioned§ the indignant obſervation of Judas, that the ointment, wherewith our Lord's feet were anointed, might have been ſold for more than τριακοσιων δηναριων, it was, doubtleſs, his view to acquaint us with the value of the gift. Once more, when Philip remarked to our Lord who had propoſed to feed the multitude in the de-

* Till I read it lately in Dr. Geddes's Proſpectus, I did not know that Le Cene had publiſhed a verſion of the ſcriptures. The attentive reader will perceive that the criticiſms, which follow in relation to him, do not refer to that tranſlation, which I never ſaw, but ſolely to his plan. If his verſion be conformable to his own rules, it is certainly a curioſity of its kind. But that cannot be; otherwiſe the learned Doctor, though not profuſe in its praiſe, would not, on ſome points, have ſpoken ſo favourably as he has done. Could he have ſaid, for inſtance, that he is very ſeldom biaſſed by party-prejudices? If Le Cene was faultleſs on this article, much may be ſaid to exculpate Beza. Their parties were different, but their error was the ſame. See Diſſ. X. P. V. § 13.

† Rev. vi. 6. ‡ Matth. xxvi. 15. § John xii. 5.

deſert *, διακοσιων δηναριων αρτοι, *two hundred penny-worth of bread*, as it runs in the common verſion, *is not ſufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little*, it was the deſign of the hiſtorian to ſupply us with a kind of criterion for computing the number of the people preſent. But this could be no criterion, unleſs we knew the value of the δηναριον.

§ 5. 'But,' ſay thoſe modern correctors, 'in the 'examples abovementioned, when the knowledge of 'the value of the coin, and the capacity of the mea-'ſure, is of importance to the ſenſe, no method can 'be equal, in point of perſpicuity, to that recom-'mended by us, whereby both are reduced to an e-'quivalent in the monies and meaſures of the coun-'try. Thus, the firſt paſſage quoted would be ren-'dered, *A meaſure of wheat, capable of ſupporting a man* '*for one day*,' for thus Le Cene propoſes to tranſlate χοινιξ, *for ſevenpence halfpenny*. The ſecond, *The* '*chief prieſts covenanted with Judas for three pounds fif-*'*teen ſhillings ſterling*. The third, *Why was not this* '*ointment ſold for nine pounds ſeven ſhillings and ſix* '*pence?* And the fourth, *Six pounds five ſhillings* '*would not purchaſe bread ſufficient.*'

The exceptions againſt this method are many. In the firſt place, it is a mere comment, and no tranſlation. Conſidered as a comment, it may be good; but that muſt be egregiouſly wrong as a verſion, which repreſents an author as ſpeaking of what he knew nothing about, nay, of what had no exiſtence in his time. And ſuch, ſurely, is the caſe with our ſterling money, which an interpretation of this ſort would repreſent as the current coin of Judea in the time of our Saviour. Nothing ought to be introduced by the tranſlator, from which the Engliſh reader may fairly deduce a falſe concluſion, in regard to the manners and cuſtoms of the time. Beſides, as the comparative value of their money and meaſures with ours is not founded on the cleareſt evidence, is it proper to give a queſtionable point the ſanction, as it were, of inſpiration? Add to all this, that no method can be deviſed, which would more effectually than this deſtroy the native ſimplicity and energy of the expreſſion. What is expreſſed in round numbers, in the original, is, with an abſurd minuteneſs, reduced to fractions in the verſion. Nothing can be more natural than the expreſſion, *Two hundred denarii would not purchaſe bread enough to afford every one of them a little*. This is ſpoken like one who makes a ſhrewd gueſs from what he ſees. Whereas, nothing can be more unnatural than, in ſuch a caſe, to deſcend to fractional parts, and ſay, *Six pounds five ſhillings would not purchaſe*. This is what nobody would have ſaid, that had not previouſly made the computation. Juſt ſo, the round ſum of three hundred denarii might very naturally be conjectured, by one preſent, to be about the value of the ointment. But, for one to go ſo nearly to work as to ſay, *Nine pounds ſeven ſhillings and ſix pence might have been gotten for this li-quor*, would directly ſuggeſt to the hearers, that he had weighed it, and computed its value at ſo much a pound. There is this additional abſurdity in the laſt example, that it is ſaid, επανω, *more than*: conſe-quently, it is mentioned, not as the exact account, but as a plauſible conjecture, rather under than above the price. But does any body, in conjectures of this kind, acknowledged to be conjectures, deſcend to fractional parts?

§ 6. Now, if this method would ſucceed ſo ill in the firſt of the three caſes mentioned, it will be found to anſwer ſtill worſe in the other two, where little de-pends on the knowledge of the value. In the ſe-cond, I may ſay, nothing depends on it. Now, there are ſeveral paſſages, wherein coins and meaſures are mentioned, in which the value of the coin, or the capacity of the meaſure, is of no conceivable conſe-quence to the import of the paſſage. In this caſe, either the ſecond or the third method, above ſpecifi-ed, is preferable to the introduction of a foreign term, not uſed in other places of the verſion, and no way neceſſary to the ſenſe. But let it be obſerved of the ſecond method, that I am never for uſing ſuch names of coins and meaſures as are peculiarly modern, or European, and not applied to the money and mea-ſures of ancient and Oriental countries: for ſuch terms always ſuggeſt the notion of a coincidence with us, in things wherein there was actually no coincidence.

We read in the common verſion †, *Neither do men light a candle and put it under a buſhel*, υπο τον μοδιον, *but on a candleſtick*. Every perſon muſt be ſenſible, that the ſize of the meaſure is of no conſequence here to the ſenſe: the intention being ſolely to ſignify, that a light is brought, not to be covered up, but to be placed where it may be of uſe in lighting the houſehold. The general term *corn-meaſure*, perfectly anſwers the author's purpoſe in this place; and as nowhere, but in the expreſſion of this very ſentiment, does the word μοδιος occur in the Goſpels, there is no reaſon for adopting it. The term *buſhel* ſerves well enough for conveying the import of the ſentiment; but as it indirectly ſuggeſts an untruth, namely, the ancient uſe of that meaſure in Judea, it is evidently improper. For an example in money, our Lord ſays, when the Phariſees interrogated him about the law-fulneſs of paying the tribute impoſed by their conque-rors ‡, Επιδειξατε μοι δηναριον, rendered in the common verſion, *ſhow me a penny*, the ſequel evinces that it was

* John vi. 7. † Matth. v. 15. ‡ Luke xx. 24.

of no importance what the value of the money was; the argument is affected solely by the figure and inscription on it. And, if in no other place of the Gospels the value of that coin had affected the sense more than it does here, it might have been rendered by the general phrase *piece of money*. Now let us see how *Le Cene*'s method does with those two examples. In the first he would say, *Neither do men light a candle to put it under a measure which contains about a pint less than a peck*. Or, according to the manner which he sometimes adopts, *containing such a precise number of eggs* (I do not recollect how many); would not this particularity in fixing the capacity of the measure, but too manifestly convey the insinuation that there would be nothing strange or improper in men's putting a lighted candle under any other measure larger or smaller than that whereof the capacity is, as a matter of principal moment, so nicely ascertained? A strange way this of rendering Scripture perspicuous!

Nor does it answer better in coins than in measures. When our Lord said, Επιδειξατε μοι δηναριον, the very words imply that it was a single piece he wanted to see; and what follows supplies us with the reason. But how does this suit *Le Cene*'s mode of reduction? *Show me seven pence halfpenny*. Have we any such piece? The very demand must, to an English reader, appear capricious, and the money asked could not be presented otherwise than in different pieces, if not in different kinds. It is added, *Whose image and superscription hath it?* Is this a question which any man would put, *Whose image and superscription hath seven pence halfpenny?* 'But there may have been formerly '*seven pence halfpenny pieces*, though we have none 'now.' Be it so. Still, as it is unsuitable to have the head and inscription of a Roman emperor on what must, from the denomination, be understood to be British coin, they ought, for the sake of consistency, and for making the transformation of the money complete, to render the reply to the aforesaid question, *George*'s instead of *Cesar*'s. If this be not translating into English, it is perhaps superior; it is what some moderns call *Englishing*, *making English*, or *doing into English*; for all these expressions are used. Poems done in this manner are sometimes more humbly termed *imitations*.

§ 7. I OBSERVED a third case that occurs in the Gospels with respect to money and measures, which is when the value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure mentioned, does not, but the comparative value of the articles specified, does affect the sense. Of this kind some of our Lord's parables furnish us with excellent examples. Such is the parable of the pounds *. I shall here give as much of it as is necessary for my present purpose, first in the vulgar translation, then in *Le Cene*'s manner. 13. *He called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.* 16. *The first came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds, and he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities.* Nothing can be more manifest than that it is of no consequence to the meaning and design of this brief narration, what the value of the pound was, great or little. Let it suffice that it here represents the whole of what we receive from our Creator to be laid out in his service. In the accounts returned by the servants, we see the different improvements which different men make of the gifts of heaven; and in the recompences bestowed, we have their proportional rewards. But these depend entirely on the numbers mentioned, and are the same, whatever be the value of the money. I shall now, in reducing them to our standard, follow the rates assigned on the margin of the English Bible. Ducats, so often mentioned by *Le Cene*, are no better known to the generality of our people than talents or minæ are. Whether the rate of conversion I have adopted be just or not, is of no consequence. I shall therefore take it for granted that it is just. The different opinions of the comparative value of their money and ours, nowise affect the argument. The objections are against the reduction from the one species to the other, not against the rule of reducing.

The foregoing verses so rendered will run thus: *He called his ten servants, and delivered them thirty-one pounds five shillings sterling, and said, Occupy till I come. The first came, saying, Lord, thy three pounds two shillings and sixpence, have gained thirty-one pounds five shillings; and he said to him, Well, thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy three pounds two shillings and sixpence, have gained fifteen pounds twelve shillings and sixpence. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities.* In regard to the parable of the talents †, it is needless, after the specimen now given, to be particular. I shall therefore give only part of one verse thus expressed in the common version. *To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one*; which, in *Le Cene*'s manner, would be, *To one he gave nine hundred thirty-seven pounds ten shillings sterling. To another three hundred seventy-five pounds. And to another one hundred eighty-seven pounds ten shillings.* In both examples, what is of real importance, the comparative degrees of improvement and proportional rewards, which in the

* Luke xix. 13, &c.

† Matth xxv. 14.

original, and in the common verſion, are diſcovered at a glance, are, if not loſt, ſo much obſcured by the complicated terms employed in the verſion, that it requires an arithmetical operation to diſcover them. In the example of the king who called his ſervants to account *, this manner is, if poſſible, ſtill more awkward, by reaſon of the largeneſs of the ſums. One of them is repreſented as owing to the king one million eight hundred ſeventy-five thouſand pounds, and his fellow-ſervant as indebted to him three pounds two ſhillings and ſixpence. There is ſome importance in the comparative value of the denarius and the talent, as it appears evidently one purpoſe of our Lord in this parable, to ſhow how inſignificant the greateſt claims we can make on our fellow-creatures, are, compared with thoſe which divine juſtice can make on us. And though this be ſtrongly marked when the two ſums are reduced to one denomination, this advantage does not conterbalance the badneſs of the expreſſion ſo groſsly unnatural, unſcriptural, and, in every ſenſe, improper. In conveying religious and moral inſtruction, to embarraſs a reader or hearer with fractions and complex numbers, is in a ſpirit and manner completely the reverſe of our Lord's.

§ 8. I WILL not further try the patience of my readers with what has been propoſed in the ſame taſte, with reſpect to the meaſures, both liquid and dry, mentioned in Scripture, in the exhibition of their reſpective capacities by the number of eggs they could contain. I am afraid I have deſcended into too many particulars already, and ſhall therefore only add in general that, in this way, the beautiful and perſpicuous ſimplicity of holy writ, is exchanged for a frivolous minuteneſs, which deſcends to the loweſt denomination of parts, more in the ſtyle of a penurious money-broker, than in that of a judicious moraliſt, not to ſay, a divine teacher. Perſpicuity is therefore injured, not promoted by it, and to thoſe important leſſons, an appearance, or rather a diſguiſe, is given which ſeems calculated to ruin their effect. That author has never reflected on what I think ſufficiently obvious, that when a piece of money is named, the name is underſtood to denote ſomething more than the weight of the ſilver or the gold. In the earlieſt ages, when it was only by weight that the money of the ſame metal was diſtinguiſhed, if the weight was the ſame, or nearly ſo, the names uſed in different languages ſerved equally well. It was therefore both natural and proper in the Seventy to render the Hebrew כבר *chechar*, in Greek, ταλαντον, and שקל *ſhekel*, διδραχμα. For the Alexandrian διδραχμα, which was double the Attic referred to in the New Teſtament, was half an ounce. But though ſuch terms might, with propriety, be uſed promiſcuouſly, when the different denominations of money expreſſed ſolely their different weights, as was the caſe in the earlier ages of the Jewiſh commonwealth, it is not ſo now. The name ſignifies a coin of a particular form and ſize, ſtamp and inſcription. The Hebrew *ſhekel*, the Greek *ſtater*, and the Britiſh *half-crown*, being each about half an ounce of ſilver, are nearly equivalent. But the names are not ſynonymous. If one had promiſed to ſhow you a *ſtater*, or a *ſhekel*, would you think, he had diſcharged his promiſe by producing *half-a-crown?*

§ 9. WORDS therefore which are by uſe excluſively appropriated to the coins and meaſures of modern nations, can never be uſed with propriety in the tranſlation of an ancient author. I have mentioned three ways which a tranſlator may take, and pointed out the different circumſtances by which the preference among thoſe methods may, in any inſtance, be determined. When the ſenſe of the paſſage does, in any degree, depend on the value of the coin, or the capacity of the meaſure, the original term ought to be retained, and if needful explained, in a note. This is the way conſtantly uſed in the tranſlation of books where mention is made of foreign coins or meaſures. What is more common than to find mention made in ſuch works of Dutch *guilders*, French *livres*, or Portugueſe *moidores?* I acknowledge, at the ſame time, the inconveniency of loading a verſion of Scripture with ſtrange and uncouth names. But ſtill this is preferable to expreſſions which, how ſmooth ſoever they be, do, in any reſpect, miſrepreſent the author, and miſlead the reader. Our ears are accuſtomed to the foreign names which are found in the common verſion of the Old Teſtament, ſuch as *ſhekel*, *bath*, *ephah*: though where the ſame coins and meaſures are evidently ſpoken of in the New, our tranſlators have not liked to introduce them, and have ſometimes, leſs properly, employed modern names which do not correſpond in meaning.

§ 10. WE have, beſides, in the New Teſtament, the names of ſome Greek and Roman coins and meaſures not mentioned in the Old. Now, where the words are the ſame, or in common uſe coincident with thoſe uſed by the Seventy in tranſlating the Hebrew names above mentioned, I have thought it better to retain the Hebrew words, to which our ears are familiarized by the tranſlation of the Old, than to adopt new terms for expreſſing the ſame things. We ought not ſurely to make an apparent difference by means of

* Matth. xviii. 23.

the language, where we have reaſon to believe that the things meant were the ſame. When the word, therefore, in the New Teſtament, is the name of either meaſure or coin peculiar to Greeks or Romans, it ought to be retained; but when it is merely the term by which a Hebrew word, occurring in the Old Teſtament has ſometimes been rendered by the Seventy; the Hebrew name, to which the common verſion of the Old Teſtament has accuſtomed us, ought to be preferred. For this reaſon, I have, in ſuch caſes, employed them in the verſion of the Goſpels. Αργυριον I have rendered *ſhekel*, when uſed for money. This was the ſtandard coin of the Jews; and when the Hebrew word for *ſilver* occurs in a plural ſignification, as muſt be the caſe when joined with a numeral adjective, it is evidently this that is meant. It is commonly in the Septuagint rendered αργυρια, and in one place, in the common tranſlation, *ſilverlings**. In Hebrew כסף *cheſeph* and שקל *ſhekel*, are often uſed indiſcriminately, and both are ſometimes rendered by the ſame Greek word. Though talent is not a word of Hebrew extraction, the Greek ταλαντον is ſo conſtantly employed by the Seventy in rendering the Hebrew ככר *checher*, and is ſo perfectly familiar to us, as the name of an ancient coin of the higheſt value, that there can be no doubt of the propriety of retaining it. As to the word *pound*, in Greek μνα, and in Hebrew מנה *maneh*, as the ſenſe of the only paſſage wherein it occurs in the Goſpel, could hardly, in any degree, be ſaid to depend on the value of the coin mentioned, I have alſo thought proper to retain the name which had been employed by the Engliſh tranſlators. Though *pound* is the name of a particular denomination of our own money, we all know that it admits alſo an indefinite application to that of other nations. This is ſo well underſtood, that where there is any riſk of miſtaking, we diſtinguiſh our own by the addition of *ſterling*. The Greek word and the Engliſh are alſo analogous in this reſpect, that they are names both of money and of weight. Both alſo admit ſome latitude, in the application to the monies and weights of different countries, whoſe ſtandards do not entirely coincide.

In regard to ſome other words, though *penny* is often uſed indefinitely, the common meaning differs ſo much from that of δηναριον in Scripture, and the plural *pence* is ſo rarely uſed with that latitude, that I thought it better to retain the Latin word. I have reſerved the word *penny* as a more proper tranſlation of ασσαριον, between which and a *penny ſterling*, the difference in value is inconſiderable. This naturally determined me to render κοδραντης *farthing*; for κοδραντης (that is, *quadrans*) is originally a Latin word, as well as δηναριον. They correſpond in etymology as well as in value. By this I have avoided a double impropriety into which our tranſlators have fallen. Firſt, by rendering δηναριον *a penny*, and ασσαριον *a farthing*, they make us conſider the latter as a fourth part of the former, whereas it was but one-tenth. Again, by rendering ασσαριον and κοδραντης by the ſame word, they repreſent thoſe names as ſynonymous which belong to coins of very different value. In tranſlating λεπτον, I have retained the word *mite*, which is become proverbial for the loweſt denomination of money.

§ 11. As to meaſures, wherever the knowledge of the capacity was of no uſe for throwing light on the paſſage, I have judged it always ſufficient to employ ſome general term, as *meaſure*, *barrel*, &c. Of this kind is the parable of the unjuſt ſteward. The degree of his villany is ſufficiently diſcovered by the numbers. But where it is the expreſs view of the writer to communicate ſome notion of the ſize and capacity, as in the account given of the water-pots at the marriage in Cana, or wherever ſuch knowledge is of importance to the ſenſe, thoſe general words ought not to be uſed. Such are the reaſons for the manner which I have adopted in this work, in regard to money and meaſures. There is no rule that can be followed which is not attended with ſome inconveniencies. Whether the plan here laid down be attended with the feweſt, the judicious and candid reader will judge.

PART

* Iſaiah vii. 23.

PART II.

Rites, Feſtivals, and Sects.

THE ſecond claſs of words to which it is not always poſſible to find in another language, equivalent terms, is the names of rites, feſtivals, and ſects, religious, political, or philoſophical. Of all words the names of ſects come the neareſt to the condition of proper names, and are almoſt always conſidered as not admitting a tranſlation into the language of thoſe who are unacquainted with the ſect. This holds equally of modern, as of ancient, ſects. There are no words in other languages anſwering to the Engliſh terms *whig* and *tory*, or the names of the Italian and German parties called *guelph* and *ghibelin*. It is exactly the ſame with philoſophical ſects, as *magian*, *ſtoic*, *peripatetic*, *epicurean*; and with the religious ſects among the Jews, *phariſee*, *ſadducee*, *eſſene*, *karaite*. Yet even this rule is not without exception. When the ſect has been denominated from ſome common epithet or appellative thought to be particularly applicable to the party, the tranſlation of the epithet or appellative, ſerves in other languages as a name to the ſect. Thus thoſe who are called by the Greeks τεσσαρισκαιδεκατιται, from their celebrating Eaſter on the fourteenth day of the month, were, by the Romans, called *quartidecimani*, which is a tranſlation of the word into Latin. In like manner our *quakers* are called in French *trembleurs*. Yet in this their authors are not uniform; they ſometimes adopt the Engliſh word. In regard to the ſects mentioned in the New Teſtament, I do not know that there has been any difference among tranſlators. The ancient names ſeem to be adopted by all.

§ 2. As to rites and feſtivals, which, being nearly related, may be conſidered together, the caſe is ſomewhat different. The original word, when expreſſive of the principal action in the rite, or in the celebration of the feſtival, is ſometimes tranſlated, and ſometimes retained. In theſe it is proper to follow the uſage of the language, even although the diſtinctions made may originally have been capricious. In ſeveral modern languages we have, in what regards Jewiſh and Chriſtian rites, generally followed the uſage of the old Latin verſion, though the authors of that verſion have not been entirely uniform in their method. Some words they have transferred from the original into their language; others they have tranſlated. But it would not always be eaſy to find their reaſon for making this difference. Thus the word περιτομη they have tranſlated *circumciſio*, which exactly correſponds in etymology; but the word βαπτισμα they have retained, changing only the letters from Greek to Roman. Yet the latter was juſt as ſuſceptible of a literal verſion into Latin as the former. *Immerſio*, *tinctio*, anſwers as exactly in the one caſe, as *circumciſio* in the other. And if it be ſaid of thoſe words, that they do not reſt on claſſical authority, the ſame is true alſo of this. Etymology, and the uſage of eccleſiaſtic authors, are all that can be pleaded.

Now, the uſe with reſpect to the names adopted in the Vulgate, has commonly been imitated, or rather implicitly followed, through the weſtern parts of Europe. We have deſerted the Greek names where the Latins have deſerted them, and have adopted them where the Latins have adopted them. Hence we ſay *circumciſion*, and not *peritomy*; and we do not ſay *immerſion*, but *baptiſm*. Yet when the language furniſhes us with materials for a verſion ſo exact and analogical, ſuch a verſion conveys the ſenſe more perſpicuouſly than a foreign name. For this reaſon, I ſhould think the word *immerſion* (which, though of Latin origin, is an Engliſh noun, regularly formed from the verb *to immerſe*), a better Engliſh name than *baptiſm*, were we now at liberty to make a choice. But we are not. The latter term has been introduced, and has obtained the univerſal ſuffrage: and though to us not ſo expreſſive of the action; yet, as it conveys nothing falſe, or unſuitable to the primitive idea, it has acquired a right by preſcription, and is conſequently entitled to the preference.

§ 3. I SAID that, in the names of rites or ſacred ceremonies, we have commonly followed the Vulgate. In ſome inſtances, however we have not. The great Jewiſh ceremony, in commemoration of their deliverance from Egypt, is called in the New Teſtament πασχα, the ſacred penmen having adopted the term that had been uſed by the Seventy, which is not a Greek word, but the Hebrew, or rather the Chaldaic, name in Greek letters. The Vulgate has retained *paſcha*, transferring it into the Latin character. The words in Greek and Latin have no meaning but as the name of this rite. In Engliſh the word has not been transferred, but tranſlated *paſſover*, anſwering in our language to the import of the original Hebrew.—Σκηνοπηγια, *ſcenopegia*, in the Goſpel of John*, is retained by the Vulgate, and with us tranſlated *the feaſt of tabernacles*. It would have been ſtill nearer the original Hebrew, and more conformable to the Jewiſh

* John vii. 2.

practice, to have called it *the feaſt of booths*. But the other appellation has obtained the preference. The Latins have retained the Greek name *azyma*, which we render, properly enough, *unleavened bread*. But the words *jubilee*, *ſabbath*, *purim*, and ſome others, run through moſt languages.

§ 4. THERE is a conveniency in tranſlating, rather than tranſplanting, the original term, if the word choſen be appoſite, as it more clearly conveys the import, than an exotic word, that has no original meaning or etymology in the language. This appears never in a ſtronger light than when the reaſon of the name happens to be aſſigned by the ſacred author. I ſhall give, for inſtance, that Hebrew appellative, which I but juſt now obſerved, that both the Seventy and the Vulgate have retained in their verſions, and which the Engliſh interpreters have tranſlated. The word is, *paſcha*, *paſſover*. In the explanation which the people are commanded to give of this ſervice to their children, when they ſhall enquire concerning it, the reaſon of the name is aſſigned*: *Ye ſhall ſay, It is the ſacrifice of the Lord's* PASSOVER, *who* PASSED OVER *the houſes of the children of Iſrael in Egypt, when he ſmote the Egyptians*. Now, this reaſon appears as clearly in the Engliſh verſion, which is literal, as in the original Hebrew; but it is loſt in the verſion of the Seventy, who render it thus: Ερειτε. Θυσια το ΠΑΣΧΑ τυτο Κυριω, ως ΕΣΚΕΠΑΣΕ τυς οικυς των υιων Ισραηλ εν Αιγυπτω, ηνικα επαταξε τυς Αιγυπτιυς. Here, as the words πασχα and επεπασε have no affinity, it is impoſſible to diſcover the reaſon of the name. The authors of the Vulgate, who form the word *phaſe*, in the Old Teſtament, more cloſely after the Hebrew (though they call it *paſcha* in the New), have thought proper, in turning that paſſage, to drop the name they had adopted, and tranſlate the word *tranſitus*, that the alluſion might not be loſt. *Dicetis, victima* TRANSITUS *Domini eſt, quando* TRANSIVIT *ſuper domos filiorum Iſrael in Ægypto, percutiens Ægyptios.*

This manner is ſometimes neceſſary, for giving a juſt notion of the ſenſe. But it is ſtill better when the uſual name, in the language of the verſion, as happens in the Engliſh, preſerves the analogy, and renders the change unneceſſary. In proper names, it is generally impoſſible to preſerve the alluſion in a verſion. In ſuch caſes, the natural reſource is the margin. The occaſion is not ſo frequent in appellatives, but it occurs ſometimes. It is ſaid, by Adam, of the woman†, ſoon after her formation, *She ſhall be called* WOMAN, *becauſe ſhe was formed out of* MAN. Here the affinity of the names, woman and man, is preſerved, without doing violence to the language. But, in ſome verſions, the affinity diſappears altogether, and, in others, is effected by aſſigning a name which, if it may be uſed at all, cannot, with propriety, be given to the ſex in general. It is loſt in the Septuagint. Αυτη κληθησεται ΓΥΝΗ, οτι εκ του ΑΝΔΡΟΣ αυτης ελημφθη αυτη. Not the ſhadow of a reaſon appears in what is here aſſigned as the reaſon. The ſounds γυνη and ανδρος have no affinity. The ſame may be ſaid of *mulier* and *vir* in Caſtalio's Latin. *Hæc vocabitur* MULIER, *quia ſumpta de* VIRO *eſt*. Other Latin interpreters have, for the ſake of that reſemblance in the words, on which the meaning of the expreſſion depends, choſen to ſacrifice a little of their latinity. The Vulgate, and Leo de Juda, have, *Hæc vocabitur* VIRAGO, *quia ſumpta de* VIRO *eſt*. Junius, Le Clerc, and Houbigant, uſe the word *vira*, upon the authority of Feſtus. Neither of the words is good in this application; but not worſe than ανδρις εξ ανδρος, uſed by Symmachus for the ſame purpoſe. Much in the ſame taſte are Luther's *mænnin*, the *homaſſe* of the Geneva French, and the *huoma* of Diodati's Italian.

PART III.

Dreſs, Judicatories, and Offices.

I SHALL now proceed to the third general claſs of words, not capable of being tranſlated, with exactneſs, into the language of a people whoſe cuſtoms are not in a great meaſure conformable to the cuſtoms of thoſe amongſt whom ſuch words have ariſen. This claſs comprehends names relating to dreſs, peculiar modes, judicatories, and offices. In regard to *garments*, it is well known, that the uſages of the ancients, particularly the Orientals, differed conſiderably from thoſe of modern Europeans. And though I am by

* Exodus xii. 27. † Gen. 23.

by no means of opinion, that it is neceſſary, in a tranſlation, to convey an idea of the exact form of their dreſs, when nothing in the piece tranſlated appears to depend on that circumſtance, I am ever for avoiding that which would poſitively convey a falſe notion in this or any other reſpect. Often, from that which may be thought a trivial deviation from truth, there will reſult inconveniencies, of which one at firſt is not aware, but which, nevertheleſs, may produce in the mind of the attentive reader, unacquainted with the original, objections that affect the credibility of the narration. A general name, therefore, like *clothes*, *raiment*, is ſufficient, when nothing depends on the form, in like manner as *a piece of money*, *a corn meaſure*, will anſwer, when no light, for underſtanding the ſcope of the place, can be derived from the value of the one or the capacity of the other. Where ſome diſtinction, however, ſeems to have been intended in the paſſage, there is a neceſſity for uſing names more definitive. It is not often neceſſary, for naming the parts of dreſs, to retain the terms of a dead language. The Engliſh tranſlators have never done it, as far as I remember, except in naming that part of the ſacerdotal veſtments, called *the ephod*, for which it would be impoſſible to find an appoſite term in any European tongue. *Phylacteries*, too, will perhaps be accounted an exception.

§ 2. But, though it is rarely neceſſary to adopt the ancient or foreign names of garments, it may not be always proper to employ thoſe terms for expreſſing them, which are appropriated to particular pieces of the modern European habit. The word *coat* anſwers well enough as a name for the under garment, in Greek χιτων. *Cloak*, by which our tranſlators in the New Teſtament commonly render ἱματιον, the name for the upper garment, I do not ſo much approve. My reaſons are theſe: Firſt, *cloak* is not the term that they have uſed in the Old Teſtament for that veſtment; though we have no reaſon to believe that there was any change in the Jewiſh faſhions in this particular. It is well known, that the modes, reſpecting dreſs, are not, nor ever were, in Aſia, as at preſent they are in Europe, variable and fluctuating. The Orientals are as remarkable for conſtancy in this particular, as we are for the contrary. Now, though the Hebrew words, anſwering to ἱματιον, are frequent in the Old Teſtament, and the Greek word itſelf in the tranſlation of the Seventy, the word *cloak* has never been admitted by our tranſlators into the verſion of the Old Teſtament, except once in Iſaiah *, where it is uſed only as a ſimile. Wherever they have thought proper to diſtinguiſh the upper garment from that worn cloſe to the body, they have named it the *mantle*. See the places marked in the margin †. But theſe are not all the places in which the original word might have been ſo rendered. Sometimes, indeed, it means garments in general, and in the plural, eſpecially, ſignifies *clothes*. Now, though the difference of a name employed in the verſion of the Old Teſtament may be thought too ſlight a circumſtance for founding an argument upon, in regard to the manner of tranſlating the New, I cannot help thinking that, even if the words *mantle* and *cloak* were equally proper, we ought not, by an unneceſſary change, without any reaſon, to give ground to imagine, that there had been, in this article, any alteration in the Jewiſh cuſtoms.

Secondly, I am the more averſe to introduce, in the New Teſtament, a change of the name that had been uſed in the Old, as it is evident that, in Judea, they placed ſome ſhare of religion in retaining their ancient garb. They did not think themſelves at liberty to depart from the cuſtoms of their anceſtors in this point. As their law had regulated ſome particulars in relation to their habit, they looked upon the form as intended for diſtinguiſhing them from the heathen, and conſequently as ſacred ‡: the knots of ſtrings which they were appointed to put upon the four corners or wings, as they called them, did not ſuit any other form of outer garment, than that to which they had been always accuſtomed.

Thirdly, the word *mantle* comes nearer a juſt repreſentation of the looſe veſture worn by the Hebrews, than *cloak*, or any other term, which refers us to ſomething particular in the make. Whereas their ἱματιον was an oblong piece of cloth, ſquare at the corners, in ſhape reſembling more the *plaid* of a Scotch Highlander, than either the Greek *pallium* or the Roman *toga*. This mantle, it would appear, on ordinary occaſions, they threw looſely about them; and, when employed in any ſort of work in which it might encumber, them, laid aſide altogether. To this, doubtleſs, our Lord refers, in that expreſſion §, *Let not him who ſhall be in the field, return home to fetch his mantle.* When ſetting out on a jonrney, or entering on any buſineſs, compatible with the uſe of this garment, they tucked it up with a girdle, that it might not incommode them. Hence, the ſimilitude of having their *loins girt*, to expreſs alertneſs, and habitual preparation for the diſcharge of duty. I know not why thoſe who have been ſo inclinable, in ſome other articles, to give a modern caſt

* Iſaiah lix. 17. Ezra ix. 3. 5. Job i. 20. † Judges iv. 18. Job ii. 12. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14. 1 Kings xix. 13. 19. Pſal. cix. 29. 2 Kings ii. 8. 13, 14.
‡ Numb. xv. 38, 39. Deut. xxii. 12. § Mark xiii. 16.

caſt to the manners of thoſe ancients, have not modernized them in this alſo, and transformed *girding their loins*, a very antique phraſe, into *buttoning their waiſtcoats*. This freedom would not be ſo great, as the reduction of their money and meaſures above conſidered. It would not even be greater than giving them *candles* for *lamps*, and making them ſit at their meals, inſtead of reclining on couches. In regard to this laſt mode, I propoſe to conſider it immediately.

§ 3. Of all their cuſtoms they were not ſo tenacious, as of what regarded the form of their clothes. In things which were not conceived to be connected with religion, and about which neither the law nor tradition, had made any regulation, they did not heſitate to conform themſelves to the manners of thoſe under whoſe power they had fallen. A remarkable inſtance of this appears, in their adopting the mode of the Greeks and Romans, in lying on couches at their meals. In the Old Teſtament times, the practice of ſitting on ſuch occaſions, appears to have been univerſal. It is juſtly remarked by Philo *, that Joſeph "made his brethren ſit down according to their ages; "for men were not then accuſtomed to lie on beds at "entertainments." The words, in the Septuagint †, are εκαθισαν ενωπιον αυτου; in the Engliſh tranſlation, *They ſat before him*; both literally from the Hebrew. In like manner ‡, εκαθισαν δε φαγειν αρτον, *they ſat down to eat bread*; and §, εκαθισεν ὁ λαος φαγειν και πιειν, *the people ſat down to eat and drink*. But it were endleſs to enumerate all the examples. Suffice it to obſerve, that this is as uniformly employed to expreſs the poſture at table in the Old Teſtament, as ανακλινω, or ſome ſynonymous term, is employed, for the ſame purpoſe, in the New. The Hebrew word is equally unequivocal with the Greek. It is always ישב *jaſhab*, *to ſit*, never שכב *ſhachab*, or any other word that imports lying down.

Some, indeed, have contended, that this manner of eating was practiſed among the Jews before the captivity; and in ſupport of this opinion, have produced the paſſage in Samuel ‖, where Saul is ſpoken of as eating on the bed. But the paſſage, when examined, makes clearly againſt the opinion for which it has been quoted. The hiſtorian's expreſſion is, *ſat upon the bed*. Nor is this, as in the New Teſtament, the ſtyle merely of modern tranſlators; it is that of the original, as well as of all the ancient tranſlations. The Septuagint ſays εκαθισε, the Vulgate *ſedit*. Houbigant is the only tranſlator I know (who, miſled, I ſuppoſe, by the ordinary ſtyle of Latin authors), has ſaid *decubuit*. The Hebrew word is ישב *jaſhab*, which never ſignifies *to lie*. Now, whether a man on a bed take his repaſt ſitting, after the European manner, with his feet on the floor, or after the Turkiſh, with his legs acroſs under him, his poſture differs totally from that of the ancient Greeks and Romans, who lay at their length.

The words of the Prophet Amos ¶ have alſo been thought to favour the ſame opinion: *Wo to them that lie upon beds of ivory, and ſtretch themſelves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the ſtall, that chant to the ſound of the viol*, &c. Here the Prophet upbraids the people with their ſloth and luxury, ſpecifying a few inſtances in their manner of living. But nothing is ſaid that implies any other connection among theſe inſtances, than that of their being the effects of the ſame cauſe, *voluptuouſneſs*. We have no more reaſon to connect their eating the lambs and the calves with their lying ſtretched on beds of ivory, than we have to connect with this poſture, their chanting to the ſound of the viol, and annointing themſelves with ointments.

But in the Apocryphal writings, which are poſterior in compoſition to thoſe of the Old Teſtament, and probably poſterior to the Macedonian conqueſts, though prior to the books of the New, we have the firſt indications of this change of poſture. It is ſaid of Judith** in the common verſion, that *her maid laid ſoft ſkins on the ground for her over againſt Holofernes, that ſhe might ſit and eat upon them*, ινα το εσθιειν κατακλινομενην επ αυτων, literally, that *ſhe might eat lying upon them*. Again, in Tobit ††, απεπεσα του φαγειν, not *I ſat* but *I lay down to eat*. Other examples might be given which render it probable that this faſhion was introduced into Judea by the Greeks, before the Jews became acquainted with the Romans. A ſure evidence this, that the Jews were not ſo obſtinately tenacious of every national cuſtom, as ſome have repreſented them. It is very remarkable that, in our Savior's time, the change was ſo univerſal in Judea, that the very common people always conformed to it. The multitudes which our Lord twice fed in the deſert, are by all the Evangeliſts repreſented as *lying*, not *ſitting*, upon the ground. It is ſtrange that our tranſlators have here, by miſinterpreting one word, as invariably exhibited them practiſing a cuſtom which they had abandoned, as they had had formerly, by the unwarranted and unneceſſary change of a name, given ground to think that there was as an alteration in their cuſtoms, when there was none.

§ 4. I

* Εξης δε τρεταξατος κατα τας ηλικιας καθιζεσθαι, μηπω των ανθρωπων εν τοις συμποτικοις στεγοις κατακλισει χρωμενων. Lib. de Joſepho.

† Gen. xliii. 33. ‡ Gen. xxxvii. 25. § Exod. xxxii. 6. ‖ Sam. xxviii. 23. ¶ Amos vi. 4, &c.
** Judith xii. 15. †† Tobit ii. 1.

§ 4. I KNOW it is commonly pleaded in excuſe for ſuch deviations from the original, as that whereof I am now ſpeaking, that the poſture is a circumſtance noway material to the right underſtanding of the paſſages wherein it is occaſionally mentioned; that beſides, to us moderns, there appears in the expreſſions *lying down to meat*, and *laying themſelves at table*, from their repugnancy to our cuſtoms, an awkwardneſs which, ſo far from contributing to fix our minds on the principal ſcope of the author, would divert our attention from it. In anſwer to the firſt of theſe objections, I admit that it is ſometimes, not always, as will ſoon be ſhown, of no conſequence to the import of a paſſage, whether a mere circumſtance, which is but occaſionally mentioned, and on which the inſtruction conveyed in the ſtory does not depend, be rightly apprehended or not. The two miracles of the loaves and fiſhes are to all valuable purpoſes the ſame, whether the people partook of their repaſt ſittting or lying. The like may be ſaid of the greater part of ſuch narratives. For this reaſon I do not except againſt a general expreſſion, as, *placed themſelves at table*, where a literal verſion would be attended with the inconvenience of appearing unnatural: but I could never approve, for the ſake of elegance or ſimplicity, a verſion which, in effect, miſrepreſents the original; or, in other words, from which one may fairly deduce inferences that are not conformable to fact. In regard to the other exception, I cannot help obſerving, that it is only becauſe the expreſſion *lying at meat* is unuſual, that it appears awkward. If the firſt tranſlators of the Bible into Engliſh had thought fit, in this inſtance, to keep cloſe to the original, the phraſes would not now have ſounded awkwardly. But it muſt be owned that no tranſlators enjoy at preſent equal advantages with thoſe who had, in a manner, the forming of our language in regard to things ſacred. Their verſions, by being widely diſperſed, would ſoon give a currency to the terms uſed in them, which there was then no contrary uſe to counterbalance. And this is the reaſon why many things which might have been better rendered then, cannot now ſo well be altered.

§ 5. BUT to ſhow that even ſuch errors in tranſlating, however trivial they may appear, are ſometimes highly injurious to the ſenſe, and render a plain ſtory not only incredible but abſurd, I muſt entreat the reader's attention to the following paſſage, as it runs in the common verſion*: *One of the Phariſees deſired Jeſus that he would eat with him; and he went into the Phariſee's houſe, and ſat down to meat. And behold a woman in the city, which was a ſinner, when ſhe knew that Jeſus ſat at meat in the Phariſee's houſe, brought an alabaſter box of ointment, and ſtood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to waſh his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kiſſed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.* Now a reader of any judgment will need to reflect but a moment to diſcover, that what is here told is impoſſible. If Jeſus and others were in our manner of ſitting together at meat, the woman could not be behind them, when doing what is here recorded. She muſt in that caſe, on the contrary, have been under the table. The chairs, on which the gueſts were ſeated, would have effectually precluded acceſs from behind. It is ſaid alſo that ſhe ſtood, while ſhe bathed his feet with tears, wiped them with the hairs of her head, and anointed and kiſſed them. Another manifeſt abſurdity. On the ſuppoſition of their ſitting, ſhe muſt have been at leaſt kneeling, if not lying on the floor. Theſe inconſiſtencies inſtantly diſappear, when the evangeliſt is allowed to ſpeak for himſelf, who, inſtead of ſaying that *Jeſus ſat down*, ſays expreſsly that he *lay down*, ανεκειτο. And to prevent, if poſſible, a circumſtance being miſtaken or overlooked, on which the practicability of the thing depended, he repeats it by a ſynonymous term in the very next verſe. "When ſhe knew that Jeſus lay at table," κατακειται. The knowledge of their manner at meals makes every thing in this ſtory level to an ordinary capacity.

§ 6. AT their feaſts, matters were commonly ordered thus: Three couches were ſet in the form of the Greek letter π, the table was placed in the middle, the lower end whereof was left open, to give acceſs to the ſervants, for ſetting and removing the diſhes, and ſerving the gueſts. The other three ſides were incloſed by the couches, whence it got the name of triclinium. The middle couch, which lay along the upper end of the table, and was therefore accounted the moſt honourable place, and that which the Phariſees are ſaid particularly to have affected, was diſtinguiſhed by the names πρωτοκλισια †. The perſon intruſted with the direction of the entertainment was called αρχιτρικλινος ‡. The gueſts lay with their feet backwards, obliquely, acroſs the couches, which were covered, for their better accommodation, with ſuch ſort of cloth, or tapeſtry, as ſuited the quality of the entertainer. As it was neceſſary, for the better conveniency of eating, that the couches ſhould be ſomewhat higher than the table, the gueſts have probably been raiſed by them three feet, and upwards, from the floor. When theſe particulars are taken into conſideration, every circumſtance of the ſtory becomes perfectly conſiſtent and intelligible. This alſo removes the difficulty there is in the account given,

* Luke vii. 36, 37, 38. † Matth. xxiii. 6. ‡ John ii. 8.

given, by John *, of the paſchal ſupper, where Jeſus being ſet, as our tranſlators render it, at table, one of his diſciples is ſaid, in one verſe, to have been leaning on his boſom, and in another, to have been lying on his breaſt. Though theſe attitudes are hardly compatible with our mode of ſitting at meals, they were naturally conſequent upon theirs. As they lay forwards, in a direction ſomewhat oblique, feeding themſelves with their right hand, and leaning on their left arm; they no ſooner intermitted, and reclined a little, than the head of each came cloſe to the breaſt of him who was next on the left. Now, a circumſtance (however frivolous in itſelf) cannot be deemed of no conſequence, which ſerves to throw light upon the ſacred pages, and ſolve difficulties, otherwiſe inextricable. This caſe, though not properly requiring the uſe of any ancient or foreign name, I could not help conſidering minutely in this place, on account of its affinity with the other topics of which I had been treating.

§ 7. I SHALL add a few things, on the manner adopted by other tranſlators in rendering what relates to this uſage. With regard to the Latin verſions, it may naturally be ſuppoſed, that the Vulgate would be literal, and conſequently, in this particular, juſt. There was no temptation to depart from the letter. It ſuited their cuſtoms at that period, as well as the idiom of their language. And though it did not ſuit the cuſtoms of the times of modern Latin interpreters, they could have no motive, in this article, to deſert the manner of the ancient tranſlator, expreſſed in a phraſeology which both Latin and Greek claſſics had rendered familiar. As to the tranſlations into modern tongues, Luther appears to have been the firſt who, in his tranſlation into German, has, in this particular, forced the Evangeliſts into a conformity with modern faſhions. The French tranſlator, Olivetan, has avoided the falſe tranſlation of *ſitting* for *lying*, and alſo the apparent awkwardneſs of a literal verſion. In the paſſage from Luke, above quoted, he ſays, *Il ſe mit à table*; and ſpeaking of the woman, *Laquelle ayant connu qu'il etoit à table.* In the miraculous increaſe of the loaves and the fiſhes in the deſert †, he thus expreſſes himſelf: *Il commanda aux troupes de s'arranger par terre.* Diodati has, in the firſt of theſe paſſages, adopted the ſame method with the French tranſlator, ſaying, *ſi miſe a tavola*; and *ch'egli era a tavolo*; in the other, he has fallen into the error of our common veſion, and ſaid, *Jeſu commandò alle turbe, che ſi matteſſero a ſedere in terra.* Moſt other French verſions have taken the ſame method of eluding the difficulty. But all the late Engliſh verſions I have ſeen, follow implicitly the common tranſlation.

§ 8. To come now to offices and judicatories: it muſt be acknowledged that, in theſe, it is not always eaſy to ſay, as was remarked in a preceding Diſſertation ‡, whether the reſemblances to, or differences from, offices and judicatories of our own, ought to induce us to retain the original term, or to tranſlate it. But whatever be in this, or however the firſt tranſlators ought to have been determined in their choice between theſe methods, the matter is not equally open to us in this late age as it was to them. The election made by our predeceſſors, in this department, has eſtabliſhed an uſe which, except in ſome particular caſes, it would be dangerous in their ſucceſſors to violate; and which, therefore, unleſs where perſpicuity or energy requires an alteration, ought to be followed. For example, who could deny, that the Greek terms, αγγελος, αποστολος, διαβολος, might not have been as well rendered *meſſenger*, *miſſionary*, *ſlanderer*, as the words ιερευς, υπηρετης, αντιδικος, are rendered *prieſt*, *miniſter*, *adverſary*. In regard to the import of the words, there does not appear to me to be a cloſer correſpondence in the laſt mentioned, than in the firſt. Beſides, as the firſt are themſelves no other than Greek tranſlations of the Hebrew words שטן, שלוח, מלאך, *ſatan*, *ſhaluch*, *malach*, which the Seventy have not judged neceſſary to retain in another language, and in this judgment have been followed by the writers of the New Teſtament; they have given the example of tranſlating, rather than transferring, theſe appellatives into other languages; the laſt name, *ſatan*, being the only one which is ever retained by them, and that very ſeldom.

But the true ſource of the diſtinction that has been made in this reſpect by European tranſlators, is not any particular propriety in the different caſes, but the example of the old Latin tranſlator. The words which he retained with ſuch an alteration in the orthography, as adapted them to the genius of the tongue, we alſo retain, and the words which he tranſlated, we tranſlate. Becauſe he ſaid, *angelus*, *apoſtolus*, *diabolus*, which are not properly Latin words, we ſay, *angel*, *apoſtle*, *devil*, not originally Engliſh. Had he, on the contrary, uſed the terms *nuncius*, *legatus*, *calumniator*, we had probably ſubſtituted for them, *meſſenger*, *miſſionary*, *ſlanderer*, or ſome terms equivalent. For in thoſe caſes wherein the Latin interpreter has not ſcrupled to tranſlate the Greek by Latin words, neither have we ſcrupled to render them by Engliſh words. I am, however, far from affirming that the interpreters of the Latin church, either in the old Italic, or in the preſent Vulgate, have acted from caprice in their choice; though I do not always diſcover reaſons of ſuch weight for the diſtinctions they have

* John xiii. 23. 25. † Matth. xv. 35. ‡ Diſſ. II. § 5.

have made, as ſhould lead us implicitly to follow them.

There is only one example in titles of this ſort, wherein the moderns have taken the freedom to judge differently. The Greek παρακλητος, in John's Goſpel, is always retained by the author of the Vulgate, who uſes *paracletus*, but has not been followed by later tranſlators. Eraſmus has ſometimes adopted his word, and ſometimes ſaid *conſolator*, and is followed in both, by the tranſlator of Zuric. Caſtalio ſays *confirmator*, and Beza *advocatus*. Moſt modern verſions into Italian, French, and Engliſh, have, in this inſtance, followed Eraſmus in the import they have given the word in preference even to Beza. And of theſe our common verſion is one, uſing the word *comforter*. Nay, ſome French tranſlators from the Vulgate have deſerted that verſion, rendering the word either *conſolateur* or *avocat*. In general, I would pay that deference to the example of the ancient interpreters as to prefer their manner, wherever there is not, from perſpicuity, energy, or the general ſcope of the diſcourſe, poſitive reaſon to the contrary. Such reaſon, I think, we have in regard to the title laſt mentioned.* As to the term διαβολος, I have already conſidered the caſes in which it is not proper to render it *devil*†. The name αποστολος is ſo much appropriated in the New Teſtament, to a particular claſs of extraordinary miniſters, that there are very few caſes, and none that I remember in the Goſpels, where either perſpicuity or energy would require a change of the term.

§ 9. It is otherwiſe with the name αγγελος, in regard to which there are ſeveral occurrences, where the import of the ſentiment is, if not loſt, very much obſcured, becauſe the word in the verſion has not the ſame extent of ſignification with that in the original. It was obſerved before‡, that there is this difference between the impor of ſuch terms as they occur in their native tongues, whether Hebrew or Greek, and as modernized in verſions, that in the former they always retain ſomewhat of their primitive ſignification, and beſide indicating a particular being or claſs of beings, they are of the nature of appellatives, and mark a ſpecial character, function, or note of diſtinction in ſuch beings; whereas, when latinized or engliſhed, but not tranſlated into Latin or Engliſh, they anſwer ſolely the firſt of thoſe uſes, and approach the nature of proper names. Now, where there happens to be a manifeſt alluſion in the original, to the primitive and ordinary acceptation of the word in that language, that alluſion muſt be loſt in a tranſlation, where the word is properly not tranſlated, and where there is nothing is in the ſound that can ſuggeſt the alluſion. It is particularly unfortunate if it be in an argument, as the whole will be neceſſarily involved in darkneſs.

§ 10. I shall illuſtrate the preceding obſervations by ſome remarks on the following paſſage §. 4. *Being made ſo much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they: 5. For unto which of the angels ſaid he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again I will be to him a Father, and he ſhall be to me a Son. 6. And again when he bringeth in the firſt-begotten into the world, he ſaith, And let all the angels of God worſhip him. 7. And of the angels he ſaith, Who maketh his angels ſpirits, and his miniſters a flame of fire. 8. But unto the Son he ſaith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* I cannot help thinking with Grotius, that there is here a compariſon of the dignity of the different perſonages mentioned, from the conſideration of what is imported in their reſpective titles. This is at beſt but obſcurely ſuggeſted in the common verſion. For though the word *ſon* is expreſſive of a natural and near relation, the word *angel* in our language is the name of a certain order of beings, and beſide that, expreſſes nothing at all. It is not, like the original appellation, both in Hebrew and in Greek, a name of office. Further, the ſeventh verſe, as it ſtands with us, *Who maketh his angels ſpirits, and his miniſters a flame of fire*, is unintelligible; and if ſome myſtical ſenſe may be put upon it, this is at beſt but a matter of conjecture, and appears quite unconnected with the argument. It is well known that the word πνευματα rendered *ſpirits*, ſignifies alſo *winds*. That this is the meaning of it here, is evident from the paſſage ‖ whence the quotation is taken. For the Hebrew רוח *ruach*, is of the ſame extent. And though it be in that place, for the ſake of uniformity, rendered the ſame way as here, nothing can be more manifeſt, than that the Pſalmiſt is celebrating the wonders of the material creation, all the parts of which execute, in their different ways, the commands of the Creator. Our tranſlators not only render the ſame Hebrew word *wind* in the third verſe, and *ſpirits* in the fourth, but in this laſt evidently ſtart aſide from the ſubject. Nothing, on the contrary, can be better connected than the whole paſſage in the true, which is alſo the moſt obvious, interpretation, and may be thus expreſſed: *Who covereth himſelf with light as with a mantle, who ſtretcheth out the heavens like a curtain; who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters; who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh on the wings of the wind; who maketh*

U

* See the note on John xiv. 16.
† Diſſ. VI. Part I. § 2, 3, 4.
‡ Diſſ. VI. Part I. § 1.
§ Heb i. 4, &c.
‖ Pſal. civ. 4.

maketh winds his meſſengers, and flaming fire his miniſters ; who hath laid the foundations of the earth, that it ſhould never be removed.* There is an internal probability of the juſtneſs of this verſion, ariſing from the perſpicuous and cloſe connection of the parts, and an improbability in the common verſion, ariſing from their obſcurity and want of connection; verſe 4. *Who maketh his angels ſpirits, his miniſters a flaming fire,* being a digreſſion from the ſcope of the context, the material world, to the world of ſpirits.

Now, let us try the paſſage of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews referred to, how the ſame tranſlation of the words πνευμα and αγγελος by *wind* and *meſſenger*, through the whole, will ſuit the Apoſtle's reaſoning. Speaking of our Lord, he ſays, *Being as far ſuperior to the heavenly meſſengers, as the title he hath inherited is more excellent than theirs: For to which of thoſe meſſengers did God ever ſay,* "*Thou art my Son, I have to-*" *day begotten thee:*" *And again,* "*I will be to him a* "*Father, and he ſhall be to me a Son:*" *Again, when he introduceth the firſt-born into the world, he ſaith,* "*Let all God's meſſengers worſhip him.*" *Whereas, concerning meſſengers, he ſaith,* "*Who maketh winds* "*his meſſengers, and flaming fire his miniſters:*" *But to the Son,* "*Thy throne, O God, endureth for ever.*" To me it is plain, firſt, that the aim of his reaſoning is to ſhow the ſuperior excellency of the Meſſiah, from the ſuperiority of his title of *Son*, given him in a ſenſe peculiar to him (and which, from analogy to the conſtitutions of the univerſe, ſhould imply of the ſame nature with the Father), to that of *meſſenger*, which does not differ eſſentially from ſervant. Now the Engliſh word *angel* does not expreſs this. It is a name for thoſe celeſtial beings, but without ſuggeſting their function. Secondly, that, in proof of the inferiority of the title *meſſenger*, the writer urges, that it is ſometimes given even to things inanimate, ſuch as ſtorms and lightning.

Every reader of reflection admits, that there runs, through the whole paſſage, a contraſt of the things ſpoken concerning the Meſſiah, to the things ſpoken concerning angels, in order to ſhow the ſupereminence of the former above the latter. The ſeventh verſe, as now rendered, perfectly ſuits this idea, and completes one ſide of the contraſt. But does it anſwer this purpoſe in the common verſion? Not in the leaſt: for, will any one ſay, that it derogates from the higheſt dignity to be called a *ſpirit*, when it is conſidered that God himſelf is ſo denominated? And as the term, *flaming fire*, when applied to intelligent beings, muſt be metaphorical, the conſideration that, by ſuch metaphors, the energy and omniſcience of the Deity are ſometimes repreſented, will, in our eſtimation, ſerve rather to enhance than to depreſs the character. The caſe is totally different, when *flaming fire*, or lightning, in the literal ſenſe, is made the ſubject of the propoſition, and *God's meſſengers* the predicate.

§ 11. I KNOW that it has been objected to this interpretation, that רוח *ruach*, though uſed in the ſingular for *wind*, does not occur, in this ſenſe, in the plural, except when joined with the numeral adjective *four*. But from this, though it were true, we can conclude nothing. That the word is found in this meaning, in the plural, is a ſufficient ground for interpreting it ſo, when the connection requires it. Farther, though it were concluſive, it is not true. In Jeremiah†, we find, in the ſame paſſage, both ארבע רוחות *arbaugh ruchoth, four winds*, and כל הרוחות *col haruchoth, all the winds*, where it was never doubted, that both expreſſions were uſed of *the winds*. As to the inſinuation which ſome have thrown out concerning this explanation, as unfavourable to the doctrine of Chriſt's divinity, it can be accounted for only from that jealouſy, an invariable attendant on the polemic ſpirit, which ſtill continues too much to infect and diſhonour theological enquiries. This jealouſy, however, appears ſo much miſplaced here, that the above interpretation is manifeſtly more favourable to the common doctrine than the other. I ſay not this to recommend it to any party, knowing that, in theſe matters, we ought all to be determined by the impartial principles of ſound criticiſm, and not by our own prepoſſeſſions.

§ 12. BUT to return: a ſecond caſe, wherein it is better to employ the general word *meſſenger*, is, when it is not clear from the context, whether the ſacred penmen meant a celeſtial or terreſtrial being. In ſuch caſes, it is always beſt to render the term, ſo as that the verſion may admit the ſame latitude of interpretation with the original; and this can be effected only by uſing the general term. For this reaſon, in the following expreſſions, οιτινες ελαβετε τον νομον εις διαταγας αγγελων‡, and διαταγεις δι αγγελων εν χειρι μεσιτου§, it would have been better to tranſlate αγγελων *meſſengers*, as it is not certain whether ſuch extraordinary miniſters as Moſes and Joſhua, and the ſucceeding Prophets, be meant, or any of the heavenly hoſt. The ſame may be ſaid of that paſſage, οφειλει η γυνη εξουσιαν εχειν επι της κεφαλης, δια τους αγγελους‖, it being very doubtful

* Dr. Lowth (De ſacra Poeſi Hebræorum, Præl. viii.), though he retains the word *angelus*, underſtands the paſſage juſt as I do, making winds the ſubject, and angels a metaphorical attribute. "Faciens ut venti ſint angeli ſui, ut ignis ardens ſit "ſibi miniſtrorum loco." He adds: "Deſcribuntur elementa in exequendis Dei mandatis, promptа et expedita quaſi angeli, "aut miniſtri tabernaculo deſervientes.

† Jer. xlix. 36. ‡ Acts vii. 53. § Gal. iii. 19. ‖ 1 Cor. xi. 10.

doubtful whether the word, in this place, denotes *angels* or *men*.

§ 13. A THIRD caſe, wherein (I do not ſay it muſt, but) it may, properly be rendered *meſſengers*, is when, though it evidently refers to ſuperior beings, it is joined with ſome word or epithet, which ſufficiently marks the reference, as αγγελος Κυριε, *a meſſenger of the Lord*, οι αλλοι των αγιων, *the heavenly meſſengers*, οι αγιοι αγγελοι, *the holy meſſengers*; for, with the addition of the epithet, the Engliſh is juſt as explicit as the Greek. Not but that ſuch epithets may in ſome ſenſe be applied to men alſo; but it is cuſtomary with the ſacred writers thus to diſtinguiſh the inhabitants of heaven. In this caſe, however, it muſt be admitted, that either way of tranſlating is good. There is one advantage in ſometimes adopting this manner, that it accuſtoms us to the word *meſſenger* in this application, and may conſequently aſſiſt the unlearned in applying it in doubtful caſes. In ſome caſes, not doubtful, to add the word *heavenly* in the verſion, is no interpolation, for the ſingle word αγγελος often includes it. Thus, though the word γλωσσα originally means no more than *tongue*, it is frequently employed to denote an unknown or foreign tongue.

§ 14. A FOURTH caſe, wherein the general term is proper, is when the word is applied to a human being. This rule, however, admits ſome exceptions, ſoon to be taken notice of. Our tranſlators have rightly rendered it *meſſenger*, in the inſtances which fall under this deſcription noted in the margin *, wherein they are not only human beings that are meant, but the meſſage is from men.

§ 15. I SAID, that there are ſome exceptions from this rule. The firſt is, when not only the meſſage is from God, but when it appears to be the view of the writer to ſhow the dignity of the miſſion, from the title given to the miſſioner, as being a title which he has in common with ſuperior natures: in ſuch caſes, it is better to preſerve in the verſion the term *angel*, without which the alluſion is loſt, and by conſequence juſtice is not done to the argument. For this reaſon the word *angel* ought to be retained in the noted paſſage of the Goſpels concerning John the Baptiſt †: *What went you to ſee; A Prophet? Yea, I tell you, and ſomething ſuperior to a Prophet; for this is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold I ſend mine angel before thee, who ſhall "prepare thy way."* There is, manifeſtly, couched here a compariſon between the two titles *prophet* and *angel*, with a view to raiſe the latter. Now, to this end the common Engliſh word *meſſenger* is not adapted, as it does not convey to us the idea of greater dignity than that of a Prophet, or even of ſo great. My argument here may be thought not quite conſiſtent with what I urged in my firſt remark on this word. But the two caſes are rather oppoſite than ſimilar. The alluſion was there to the ordinary ſignification of the term; the alluſion is here not to the ſignification, but to the common application of it, to beings of a ſuperior order. The intention was there, comparatively, to depreſs the character, the intention here is to exalt it.

§ 16. ANOTHER caſe, in which the word *angel* ought to be retained, though uſed of man, is when there would ariſe either obſcurity or ambiguity from the conſtruction, if the word *meſſenger* ſhould be employed. It cannot be doubted, that the angels of the ſeven churches mentioned in the Apocalypſe ‡, are human creatures; but the term *meſſenger* would render the expreſſion ambiguous or rather improper. The meſſenger of ſocieties (in like manner as of individuals), is one ſent by them, not to them In this, and ſome other inſtances, the Greek αγγελος is to be underſtood as correſponding in extent of ſignification to the Hebrew מלאך *malach*, which often denotes *a miniſter*, or ſervant employed in any charge of importance and dignity, though not a meſſage. It would, therefore, be no deviation from what is included in the Helleniſtic ſenſe of the word, if, through the whole of that paſſage, it were rendered *preſident*.

§ 17. IN what concerns civil offices, our tranſlators have, very properly, retained ſome names to which we have none entirely equivalent. Of this number is the name *tetrarch*, which admits no explanation but by a periphraſis. *Centurion* and *publican* are of the ſame kind. The word *legion*, though not a name of office, being the name of a military diviſion, to which we have not any exactly correſponding, may be ranked in the ſame claſs. The three words laſt ſpecified are neither Hebrew nor Greek, but Latin; and as they are the names of things familiar only to the Latins, they are beſt expreſſed by thoſe names of Latin derivation employed by our tranſlators. Two of them occur in the Latin form in the New Teſtament λεγιων, and κεντυριων, though for the latter word the Greek εκατονταρχος is often uſed.

It may be proper here to obſerve, in regard to ſuch Latin appellatives, that from the connection which has ſubſiſted between all European countries and the Romans, and from the general acquaintance which the Weſtern nations have long had with the ancient Roman uſages, hiſtory, and literature; their names of offices, &c. are naturalized in moſt modern languages, particularly in Engliſh. This makes the adoption of the Latin name for an office, or any other thing which

* Luke vii. 24. ix. 52. James, ii. 25. † Matth. xi. 9, 10. ‡ Rev. i. 20. ii. 1. 8. 12. 18. iii. 1. 7. 14.

the Jews had ſolely from the Romans, peculiarly pertinent. The remark now made holds, eſpecially when the perſons ſpoken of were either Romans, or the ſervants of Rome. If, therefore, after the Vulgate, we had rendered χιλιαρχος *tribune*, ανθυπατος *proconſul*, and perhaps σπειρα *cohort*, the expreſſion, without loſing any thing in perſpicuity to thoſe of an inferior claſs, would have been to the learned reader more ſignifican than *chief-captain*, *deputy*, *band*.

The word ηγεμων alſo, though ſometimes a general term, denoting *governor* or *preſident*; yet, as applied to Pilate, is known to import no more than *procurator*. Properly there was but one *preſident* in Syria, of which Judea was a part. He who had the ſuperintendency of this part was ſtyled *imperatoris procurator*. For this we have the authority of *Tacitus* the Roman annaliſt, and of *Philo* the Alexandrian Jew. And though the author of the Vulgate has commonly uſed the term *præſes* for ηγεμων yet, in tranſlating Luke *, he has rendered ηγεμονευοντος Ποντιε Πιλατε της Ιυδαιας, *procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam*. To thoſe who know a little of the language, or even of the hiſtory, of ancient Rome, the Latin names, in many caſes, are much more definite in their ſignification, than the words by which they are commonly rendered, and being already familiar in our language, are not, even to the vulgar, more obſcure than names originally Engliſh, relating to things wherewith they are little acquainted. For a ſimilar reaſon, I have alſo retained the name *pretorium*, which, though a Latin word, has been adopted by the ſacred writers, and to which neither common-hall nor judgment-hall entirely anſwers. That the Evangeliſts, who wrote in Greek, a more copious language, found themſelves compelled to borrow from the Latin, the name of what belonged to the office of a Roman magiſtrate, is to their tranſlators a ſufficient authority for adopting the ſame method.

§ 18. I SHALL conclude this Diſſertation with obſerving, that there are two judicatories mentioned in the New Teſtament, one Jewiſh, the other Grecian, the diſtinguiſhing names of which may not, without energy, be preſerved in a tranſlation. Though the noun συνεδριον is Greek, and ſuſceptible of the general interpretation *council* or ſenate; yet, as it is commonly in the Goſpels and Acts appropriated to that celebrated court of ſenators or *elders* accuſtomed to aſſemble at Jeruſalem, and from the Greek name, called *ſanhedrim*, which was at once their national ſenate and ſupreme judicatory; and as it appears not in thoſe books to have been ever applied to any other particular aſſembly, though ſometimes to ſuch in general as were veſted with the higheſt authority; I have thought it reaſonable to retain the word *ſanhedrim* in every caſe where there could be no doubt that this is the court ſpoken of. The name has been long naturalized in the language; and, as it is more confined in its application than any common term, it is ſo much the more definite and energetic. The other is the famous Athenian court called *the Areopagus*, and mentioned in the Acts †; which, as it was in ſeveral reſpects peculiar in its conſtitution, ought to be diſtinguiſhed in a verſion, as it is in the original, by its proper name. To render it *Mars-hill* from etymology, without regard to uſe, would entirely miſlead the unlearned, who could never imagine that the hiſtorian ſpoke of bringing the Apoſtle before a court, but would ſuppoſe that he only informed us that they brought him up to an eminence in the city, from which he diſcourſed to the people. This is in part effected by the common verſion; for, though in verſe 19, it is ſaid, *They brought Paul to Areopagus*, it is added in verſe 22, *Then Paul ſtood in the midſt of Mars-hill and ſaid*. This leads one to think that theſe were two names for the ſame hill. *The Areopagus* with the article is the proper verſion in both places.

* Luke iii. 1. † Acts xvii. 19.

DISSERTATION THE NINTH.

Inquiry whether certain Names which have been adopted into moſt Tranſlations of Scripture in the Weſt, coincide in Meaning with the original Terms from which they are derived, and of which they are uſed as the Verſion.

IT was obſerved, in a former Diſſertation *, as one cauſe of difficulty in the examination of the Scriptures, that before we begin to ſtudy them critically, we have been accuſtomed to read them in a tranſlation, whence we have acquired a habit of conſidering ſeveral ancient and Oriental terms as equivalent to certain words, in modern uſe, in our own language, by which they have been commonly rendered. What makes the difficulty greater is, that when we become acquainted with other verſions beſide that into our mother-tongue, theſe, inſtead of correcting, ſerve but to confirm the prejudice. For, in theſe tranſlations, we find the ſame original words rendered by words which we know to correſpond exactly in thoſe tongues, to the terms employed in the Engliſh tranſlation. In order to ſet this obſervation in the ſtrongeſt light, it will be neceſſary to trace the origin of ſome terms which have become technical amongſt eccleſiaſtic writers, pointing out the changes in meaning which they have undergone. When alterations are produced gradually, they eſcape the notice of the generality of people, and ſometimes even of the more diſcerning. For, a term once univerſally underſtood to be equivalent to an original term, whoſe place it occupies in the tranſlation, will naturally be ſuppoſed ſtill equivalent, by thoſe who do not attend to the variations in the meanings of words, which a tract of time often inſenſibly produces. Sometimes etymology contributes to favour the deception.

How few are there, even among the readers of the original, who entertain a ſuſpicion that the words *myſtery*, *blaſphemy*, *ſchiſm*, *hereſy*, do not convey to moderns preciſely thoſe ideas which the Greek words (being the ſame except in termination) μυστηριον, βλασφημια, σχισμα, αιρεσις, in the New Teſtament, conveyed to Chriſtians in the times of the Apoſtles? Yet, that there is not ſuch a correſpondence in meaning between them, as is commonly ſuppoſed, I intend, in the preſent Diſſertation, to put beyond a doubt. That there is a real difference, in regard to ſome of thoſe words is, I think, generally allowed by men of letters; but, as all are not agreed in regard to the preciſe difference between the one and the other, I ſhall here examine, briefly, the import of the original terms, in the order abovementioned that we may be qualified to judge how far they are rightly rendered by the words ſuppoſed to correſpond to them, and that we may not be miſled, by the reſemblance of ſound, to determine concerning the ſameneſs of ſignification.

PART I.

Of Myſtery.

THE Greek word μυστηριον occurs frequently in the New Teſtament, and is uniformly rendered, in the Engliſh tranſlation, *myſtery*. We all know that by the moſt current uſe of the Engliſh word *myſtery* (as well as of the Latin eccleſiaſtic word *myſterium*, and the correſponding terms in modern languages), is denoted ſome doctrine to human reaſon incomprehenſible; in other words, ſuch a doctrine as exhibits difficulties, and even apparent contradictions, which we cannot ſolve or explain. Another uſe of the

* Diſſ. II. Part III. § 6.

the word, which, though not ſo univerſal at preſent, is often to be met with in eccleſiaſtic writers of former ages, and in foreign writers of the preſent age, is to ſignify ſome religious ceremony or rite, eſpecially thoſe now denominated ſacraments. In the communion office of the church of England, the elements, after conſecration, are ſometimes termed *holy myſteries*. But this uſe ſeems not now to be common among Proteſtants, leſs perhaps in this country than in any other. Johnſton has not ſo much as mentioned it in his Dictionary. Indeed in the fourth, and ſome ſucceeding centuries, the word μυστηριον was ſo much in vogue with the Greek fathers, and *myſterium* or *ſacramentum*, as it was often rendered, with the Latin, that it would be impoſſible to ſay in what meaning they uſed the words; nay, whether or not, they affixed any meaning to them at all. In every thing that related to religion, there were found *myſteries* and *ſacraments*, in doctrines and precepts, in ordinances and petitions: they could even diſcover numbers of them in the Lord's Prayer. Nay, ſo late as Father Poſſevini, this unmeaning application of theſe terms has prevailed in ſome places. That Jeſuit is cited with approbation by Walton in the prolegomena to his Polyglot, for ſaying, "Tot eſſe in Hebraica Scriptura "ſacramenta, quot literæ; tot myſteria, quot puncta; tot arcana, quot apices," a ſentence, I acknowledge, as unintelligible to me as Father Simon owns it was to him. But paſſing this indefinite uſe, of which we know not what to make, the two ſignifications I have mentioned, are ſufficiently known to theologians, and continue, though not equally, ſtill in uſe with modern writers.

§ 2. When we come to examine the Scriptures critically, and make them ſerve for their own interpreters, which is the ſureſt way of attaining the true knowledge of them, we ſhall find, if I miſtake not, that both theſe ſenſes are unſupported by the uſage of the inſpired penmen. After the moſt careful examination of all the paſſages in the New Teſtament, in which the Greek word occurs, and after conſulting the uſe made of the term, by the ancient Greek interpreters of the Old, and borrowing aid from the practice of the Helleniſt Jews, in the writings called Apocrypha, I can only find two ſenſes nearly related to each other, which can ſtrictly be called ſcriptural. The firſt, and what I may call the leading ſenſe of the word, is *arcanum*, a ſecret, any thing not diſcloſed, not publiſhed to the world, though perhaps communicated to a ſelect number.

§ 3. Now, let it be obſerved, that this is totally different from the current ſenſe of the Engliſh word *myſtery*, ſomething incomprehenſible. In the former acceptation, a thing was no longer a myſtery than whilſt it remained unrevealed; in the latter, a thing is equally a myſtery, after the revelation, as before. To the former we apply, properly, the epithet *unknown*, to the latter we may, in a great meaſure, apply the term *unknowable*. Thus, that God would call the Gentiles, and receive them into his church, was as intelligible, or, if ye like the term better, comprehenſible, as that he once had called the deſcendants of the patriarchs, or as any plain propoſition, or hiſtorical fact. Yet, whilſt undiſcovered, or, at leaſt, veiled under figures and types, it remained, in the ſcriptural idiom, a *myſtery*, having been hidden from ages and generations. But, after it had pleaſed God to reveal this his gracious purpoſe to the Apoſtles by his Spirit, it was a myſtery no longer.

The Greek words, αποκαλυψις and μυστηριον, ſtand in the ſame relation to each other, that the Engliſh words *diſcovery* and *ſecret* do. Μυστηριον αποκαλυφθεν is a *ſecret diſcovered*, and conſequently a ſecret no longer. The diſcovery is the extinction of the ſecret as ſuch. Theſe words, accordingly, or words equivalent, as μυστηριον γνωρισθεν, φανερωθεν, are often brought together by the Apoſtles, to ſhow that what were once the ſecret purpoſes and counſels of God, had been imparted to them, to be by them promulgated to all the world. Thus, they invited the grateful attention of all to what was ſo diſtinguiſhed a favour on the part of heaven, and muſt be of ſuch unſpeakable importance to the apoſtate race of Adam. The terms, communication, revelation, manifeſtation, plainly ſhow the import of the term μυστηριον, to which they are applied. As this, indeed, ſeems now to be a point univerſally acknowledged by the learned, I ſhall only refer the judicious reader, for further proof of it from the New Teſtament, to the paſſages quoted in the margin *; in all which, he will plainly perceive, that the Apoſtle treats of ſomething which had been concealed or ages (and for that reaſon called μυστηριον), but was then openly revealed; and not of any thing, in its own nature, dark and inconceivable.

§ 4. If, in addition to the evidence ariſing from ſo many direct and clear paſſages in the writings of Paul, it ſhould be thought neceſſary to recur to the uſage of the Seventy, we find that, in the Prophet Daniel †, the word μυστηριον occurs not fewer than nine times, anſwering always to the Chaldaic רזא *raza*, *res arcana*, and uſed in relation to Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which was become *a ſecret*, even to the dreamer himſelf, as he had forgot it. The word there is uniformly

* Rom. xvi. 25, 26. 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8, 9, 10. Eph. i. 9. iii. 3. 5, 6. 9. vi. 19. Col. i. 26, 27. † Dan. ii. 18, 19. 27, 28, 29, 30. 47. iv. 9.

ly rendered in the common verſion *ſecret*; and it deſerves to be remarked that, in thoſe verſes, it is found connected with the verbs γνωριζω, φωτιζω, and αποκαλυπτω; in a way exactly ſimilar to the uſage of the New Teſtament above obſerved. It occurs in no other place of that verſion, but one in Iſaiah, of very doubtful import. In the apocryphal writings (which, in matters of criticiſm on the Helleniſtic idiom, are of good authority), the word μυστηριον frequently occurs in the ſame ſenſe, and is uſed in reference to human ſecrets, as well as to divine. Nay, the word is not, even in the New Teſtament, confined to divine ſecrets. It expreſſes ſometimes thoſe of a different, and even contrary, nature. Thus, the Apoſtle, ſpeaking of the antichriſtian ſpirit, ſays, *The myſtery of iniquity doth already work* *. The ſpirit of antichriſt hath begun to operate; but the operation is latent and unperceived. The Goſpel of Chriſt is a bleſſing, the ſpirit of antichriſt a curſe. Both are equally denominated *myſtery*, or ſecret, whilſt they remain concealed.

§ 5. I SHALL be much miſunderſtood, if any one infer, from what has been now advanced, that I mean to ſignify, that there is nothing in the doctrines of religion which is not, on all ſides, perfectly comprehenſible to us, or nothing from which difficulties may be raiſed, that we are not able to give a ſatisfactory ſolution of. On the contrary, I am fully convinced, that in all ſciences, particularly natural theology, as well as in revelation, there are many truths of this kind, whoſe evidence ſuch objections are not regarded by a judicious perſon, as of force ſufficient to invalidate. For example, the divine omniſcience is a tenet of natural religion. This manifeſtly implies God's foreknowledge of all future events. Yet, to reconcile the divine preſcience with the freedom, and even the contingency, and conſequently, with the good or ill deſert of human actions, is what I have never yet ſeen atchieved by any, and indeed deſpair of ſeeing. That there are ſuch difficulties alſo in the doctrines of revelation, it would, in my opinion, be very abſurd to deny. But the preſent inquiry does not affect that matter in the leaſt. This inquiry is critical, and concerns ſolely the ſcriptural acceptation of the word μυστηριον, which I have ſhown to relate merely to the ſecrecy for ſome time obſerved with regard to any doctrine, whether myſterious, in the modern acceptation of the word, or not.

§ 6. THE foregoing obſervations will throw ſome light on what Paul ſays of the nature of the office with which he was veſted: *Let a man ſo account of us, as of the miniſters of Chriſt, and ſtewards of the myſteries of God* †, οικονομους μυστηριων Θεου, diſpenſers to mankind of the gracious purpoſes of heaven, heretofore concealed, and therefore denominated ſecrets. Nor can any thing be more conformable than this interpretation, both to the inſtructions given to the Apoſtles, during our Lord's miniſtry, and to the commiſſion they received from him. In regard to the former, he tells them, *To you it is given to know the myſteries of the kingdom of heaven*; no ſecret, relating to this ſubject, is witheld from you; *but to them it is not given* ‡; that is, not yet given. For theſe very Apoſtles, when commiſſioned to preach, were not only empowered, but commanded, to diſcloſe to all the world §, the whole myſtery of God, his ſecret counſels in regard to man's ſalvation. And that they might not imagine that the private informations, received from their Maſter, had never been intended for the public ear, he gave them this expreſs injunction, *What I tell you in darkneſs, that ſpeak ye in light And what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the houſe tops.* He aſſigns the reaſon, the divine decree; a topic to which he oftener than once recurs. *There is nothing covered that ſhall not be revealed, and hid that ſhall not be known* ||. Again: *There is nothing hid, which ſhall not be manifeſted; neither was any thing kept ſecret, but that it ſhould come abroad* ¶. This may ſerve to explain to us the import of theſe phraſes which occur in the Epiſtles, as expreſſing the whole Chriſtian inſtitution, *the myſtery of goſpel, the myſtery of the faith, the myſtery of God, and the myſtery of Chriſt*; myſtery, in the ſingular number, not myſteries, in the plural, which would have been more conformable to the modern import of the word, as relating to the incomprehenſibility of the different articles of doctrine. But the whole of the goſpel, taken together, is denominated *the myſtery*, the grand ſecret, in reference to the ſilence or concealment under which it was formerly kept; as, in like manner, it is ſtyled the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, in reference to the publication afterwards enjoined.

§ 7. I SIGNIFIED, before, that there was another meaning which the term μυστηριον ſometimes bears in the New Teſtament. But it is ſo nearly related to, if not coincident with, the former, that I am doubtful whether I can call it other than a particular application of the ſame meaning. However, if the thing be underſtood, it is not material which of the two ways we denominate it. The word is ſometimes employed to denote the figurative ſenſe, as diſtinguiſhed from the literal, which is conveyed under any fable, parable, allegory, ſymbolical action, repreſentation, dream, or viſion. It is plain that, in this caſe, the term

* 2 Theſſ. ii. 7. † 1 Cor. iv. 1. ‡ Matth. xiii. 41. § Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15. || Matth. x. 26, 27. ¶ Mark iv. 22.

term μυστηριον is uſed comparatively; for, however clear the meaning, intended to be conveyed in the apologue, or parable, may be to the intelligent, it is obſcure, compared with the literal ſenſe, which, to the unintelligent, proves a kind of veil. The one is, as it were, open to the ſenſes; the other requires penetration and reflection. Perhaps there was ſome alluſion to this import of the term, when our Lord ſaid to his diſciples, *To you it is given to know the myſtery of the kingdom of God: but to them that are without all theſe things are done in parables* *. The apoſtles were let into the ſecret, and got the ſpiritual ſenſe of the ſimilitude, whilſt the multitude amuſed themſelves with the letter, and ſearched no further.

In this ſenſe, μυστηριον is uſed in theſe words: *The myſtery of the ſeven ſtars which thou ſaweſt in my right hand, and the ſeven golden candleſticks. The ſeven ſtars are the angels of the ſeven churches, and the ſeven candleſticks are the ſeven churches* †: Again, in the ſame book: *I will tell thee the myſtery of the woman, and of the beaſt that carrieth her*, &c. ‡. There is only one other paſſage, to which this meaning of the word is adapted, and on which I ſhall have occaſion to remark afterwards §. *This is a great myſtery, but I ſpeak concerning Chriſt and the church* ‖. Nor is it any objection to this interpretation of the word *myſtery* here, that the Apoſtle alluded not to any fiction, but to an hiſtorical fact, the formation of Eve out of the body of Adam her huſband. For, though there is no neceſſity that the ſtory which ſupplies us with the body of the parable or allegory (if I may ſo expreſs myſelf), be literally true; there is, on the other hand, no neceſſity that it be falſe. Paſſages of true hiſtory are ſometimes allegorized by the ſacred penmen. Witneſs the ſtory of Abraham and his two ſons, Iſaac by his wife Sarah, and Iſhmael by his bondwoman Hagar, of which the Apoſtle has made an allegory for repreſenting the comparative natures of the Moſaic diſpenſation and the Chriſtian ¶.

§ 8. As to the paſſage quoted from the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, let it be obſerved, that the word μυστηριον is there rendered, in the Vulgate, *ſacramentum*. Although this Latin word was long uſed very indefinitely, by eccleſiaſtical writers, it came, at length, with the more judicious, to acquire a meaning more preciſe and fixed. Firmilian calls Noah's ark the ſacrament of the church of Chriſt **. It is manifeſt, from the illuſtration he ſubjoins, that he means the ſymbol, type, or emblem, of the church; alluding to an expreſſion of the Apoſtle Peter ††. This may, on a ſuperficial view, be thought nearly coincident with the ſecond ſenſe of the word μυστηριον, above aſſigned. But, in fact, it is rather an inverſion of it. It is not, in Scripture-language, the type that is called the *myſtery*, but the antitype; nor the ſign, in any figurative ſpeech or action, but the thing ſignified. It would, therefore, have correſponded better to the import of the Greek word, to ſay, "The church of Chriſt is "the ſacrament of Noah's ark;" το μυστηριον, the ſecret antitype, which that veſſel, deſtined for the ſalvation of the choſen few, from the deluge, was intended to adumbrate. This uſe, however, not uncommon among the fathers of the third century, has given riſe to the definition of a ſacrament, as *the viſible ſign of an inviſible grace*; a definition to which ſome regard has been paid by moſt parties, Proteſtant as well as Romiſh.

§ 9. But to return to μυστηριον: it is plain that the earlieſt perverſion of this word, from its genuine and original ſenſe (a *ſecret*, or ſomethiug concealed), was in making it to denote ſome ſolemn and ſacred ceremony. Nor it is difficult to point out the cauſes that would naturally bring eccleſiaſtic writers to employ it in a ſenſe, which has ſo cloſe an affinity to a common application of the word in profane authors. Among the different ceremonies employed by the heathen, in their idolatrous ſuperſtitions, ſome were public and performed in the open courts, or in thoſe parts of the temples to which all had acceſs; others were more ſecretly performed in places from which the crowd was carefully excluded. To aſſiſt, or even be preſent at theſe, a ſelect number only was admitted, to each of whom a formal and ſolemn initiation was neceſſary. Theſe ſecret rites, on account of this very circumſtance, their ſecrecy, were generally denominated *myſteries*. They were different, according to what was thought agreeable to the different deities, in whoſe honour they were celebrated. Thus they had the myſteries of Ceres, the myſteries of Proſerpine, the myſteries of Bacchus, &c. Now there were ſome things in the Chriſtian worſhip, which, though eſſentially different from all Pagan rites, had as much reſemblance in this circumſtance, the excluſion of the multitude, as would give ſufficient handle to the heathen, to ſtyle them the Chriſtian myſteries.

§ 10. Probably the term would be firſt applied only to what was called in the primitive church, *the euchariſt*, which we call *the Lord's Supper*; and afterwards extended to *baptiſm* and other ſacred ceremonies. In regard to the firſt-mentioned ordinance, it cannot be denied, that in the article of concealment, there was a pretty cloſe analogy. Not only were all infidels, both Jews and Gentiles, excluded from witneſſing

* Mark iv. 11. † Rev. i. 20. ‡ Rev. xvii. 7. § Diſſ. X. Part III. § 9. ‖ Eph. v. 32. ¶ Gal. iv. 22, &c.
** Cyp. Epiſt. 75. in ſome editions 43. †† 1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

neſſing the commemoration of the death of Chriſt; but even many believers, particularly the catechumens and the penitents; the former, becauſe not yet initiated by baptiſm into the church; the latter, becauſe not yet reſtored to the communion of Chriſtians, after having fallen into ſome ſcandalous ſin. Beſides, the ſecrecy that Chriſtians were often, on account of the perſecutions to which they were expoſed, obliged to obſerve, which made them meet for ſocial worſhip in the night-time, or very early in the morning, would naturally draw on their ceremonies, from the Gentiles, the name of *myſteries*. And it is not unreaſonable to think, that a name which had its riſe among their enemies, might afterwards be adopted by themſelves. The name *Chriſtians*, firſt uſed at Antioch, ſeems, from the manner wherein it is mentioned in the acts *, to have been at firſt given contemptuouſly to the diſciples by infidels, and not aſſumed by themſelves. The common titles by which, for many years after that period, they continued to diſtinguiſh thoſe of their own ſociety, as we learn both from the Acts, and from Paul's Epiſtles, were *the faithful*, or believers, *the diſciples*, and *the brethren*. Yet, before the expiration of the apoſtolic age, they adopted the name *Chriſtian*, and gloried in it. The Apoſtle Peter uſes it in one place †, the only place in Scripture wherein it is uſed by one of themſelves. Some other words and phraſes which became faſhionable amongſt eccleſiaſtic writers, might naturally enough be accounted for in the ſame manner.

§ 11. But how the Greek μυστηριον came firſt to be tranſlated into Latin *ſacramentum*, it is not eaſy to conjecture. None of the claſſical ſignifications of the Latin word ſeems to have any affinity to the Greek term. For whether we underſtand it ſimply for a ſacred ceremony, *ſacramentum* from *ſacrare*, as *juramentum* from *jurare*, or for the pledge depoſited by the litigants in a proceſs, to enſure obedience to the award of the judge, or for the military oath of fidelity, none of theſe conveys to us either of the ſenſes of the word μυστηριον explained above. At the ſame time it is not denied that in the claſſical import, the Latin word may admit an alluſive application to the more ſolemn ordinances of religion, as implying in the participants a ſacred engagement equivalent to an oath. All that I here contend for is, that the Latin word *ſacramentum* does not, in any of theſe ſenſes, convey exactly the meaning of the Greek name μυστηριον, whoſe place it occupies in the Vulgate. Houbigant, a Romiſh prieſt, has, in his Latin tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, uſed neither *ſacramentum* nor *myſterium*; but where either of theſe terms had been employed in the Vulgate, he ſubſtitutes *ſecretum*, *arcanum*, or *abſconditum*. Eraſmus, though he wrote at an earlier period, has only once admitted *ſacramentum* into his verſion of the New Teſtament, and ſaid with the Vulgate *ſacramentum ſeptem ſtellarum*.

Now it is to this practice, not eaſily accounted for, in the old Latin tranſlators, that we owe the eccleſiaſtical term *ſacrament*, which, though not ſcriptural, even Proteſtants have not thought fit to reject: they have only confined it a little in the application, uſing it ſolely of the two primary inſtitutions of the Goſpel, *baptiſm* and *the Lord's ſupper*; whereas the Romaniſts apply it alſo to five other ceremonies, in all ſeven. Yet even this application is not of equal latitude with that wherein it is uſed in the Vulgate. The ſacrament of God's will ‡, the ſacrament of piety §, the ſacrament of a dream ‖, the ſacrament of the ſeven ſtars ¶, and the ſacrament of the woman **, are phraſes which ſound very ſtrangely in our ears.

§ 12. So much for the introduction of the term *ſacrament* into the Chriſtian theology, which (however convenient it may be for expreſſing ſome important rites of our religion), has, in none of the places where it occurs in the Vulgate, a reference to any rite or ceremony whatever, but is always the verſion of the Greek word μυστηριον, or the correſponding term in Hebrew or Chaldee. Now the term μυστηριον, as has been ſhown, is always predicated of ſome doctrine, or of ſome matter of fact, wherein it is the intention of the writer to denote that the information he gives either was a ſecret formerly, or is the latent meaning of ſome type, allegory, figurative deſcription, dream, viſion, or fact referred to. No religion abounded more in pompous rites and ordinances than the Jewiſh, yet they are never, in Scripture, (any more than the ceremonies of the New Teſtament) denominated either myſteries or ſacraments. Indeed with us Proteſtants, the meanings in preſent uſe aſſigned to theſe two words, are ſo totally diſtinct, the one relating ſolely to doctrine, the other ſolely to poſitive inſtitutions, that it may look a little oddly to bring them together, in the diſcuſſion of the ſame critical queſtion. But to thoſe who are acquainted with Chriſtian antiquity, and foreign uſe in theſe matters, or have been accuſtomed to the Vulgate tranſlation, there will be no occaſion for an apology.

§ 13. Before I finiſh this topic, it is proper to take notice of one paſſage wherein the word μυστηριον, it may be plauſibly urged, muſt have the ſame ſenſe with that which preſent uſe gives to the Engliſh word *myſtery*, and denote ſomething which, though revealed, is in-

* Acts xi. 26. † 1 Pet. iv. 16. ‡ Eph. i. 9. § 1 Tim. iii. 16. ‖ Dan. ii. 18. 30. 47. ¶ Rev. i. 20. ** Rev. xvii. 7.

explicable, and, to human faculties, unintelligible. The words are, *Without controverſy great is the myſtery of godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the fleſh, juſtified in the ſpirit, ſeen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory* *. I do not here enquire into the juſtneſs of this reading, though differing from that of the two moſt ancient verſions, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and ſome of the oldeſt manuſcripts. The words, as they ſtand, ſufficiently anſwer my purpoſe. Admit then that ſome of the great articles, enumerated may be juſtly called myſteries, in the eccleſiaſtical and preſent acceptation of the term; it does not follow that this is the ſenſe of the term here. When a word in a ſentence of holy writ is ſuſceptible of two interpretations, ſo that the ſentence, whichſoever of the two ways the word be interpreted, conveys a diſtinct meaning ſuitable to the ſcope of the place; and when one of theſe interpretations expreſſes the common import of the word in holy writ, and the other aſſigns it a meaning which it plainly has not in any other paſſage of Scripture, the rules of criticiſm manifeſtly require that we recur to the common acceptation of the term. Nothing can vindicate us in giving it a ſingular, or even a very uncommon, ſignification, but that all the more uſual meanings would make the ſentence involve ſome abſurdity or nonſenſe. This is not the caſe here. The purport of the ſentence plainly is, "Great unqueſtionably" is the divine ſecret, of which our religion brings the diſcovery; "God was manifeſt in the fleſh, &c."

PART II.

Of Blaſphemy.

I PROPOSED, in the ſecond place, to offer a few thoughts on the import of the word βλασφημια, frequently tranſlated *blaſphemy*. I am far from affirming that in the preſent uſe of the Engliſh word, there is ſuch a departure from the import of the original, as in that remarked in the preceding article, between μυστηριον and *myſtery*: at the ſame time it is proper to obſerve, that in moſt caſes there is not a perfect coincidence. Βλασφημια properly denotes *calumny, detraction, reproachful* or *abuſive language*, againſt whomſoever it be vented. There does not ſeem, therefore, to have been any neceſſity for adopting the Greek word into our language, one or other of the Engliſh expreſſions above mentioned, being, in every caſe, ſufficient for conveying the ſenſe. Here, as in other inſtances, we have, with other moderns, implicitly followed the Latins, who had in this no more occaſion than we, for a phraſeology not originally of their own growth. To have uniformly tranſlated, and not tranſferred, the words βλασφηλια and βλασφημειν, would have both contributed to perſpicuity, and tended to detect the abuſe of the terms when wreſted from their proper meaning. That βλασφημια and its conjugates are in the New Teſtament very often applied to reproaches not aimed againſt God, is evident from the paſſages referred to in the margin †; in the much greater part of which the Engliſh tranſlators, ſenſible that they could admit no ſuch application, have not uſed the words *blaſpheme* or *blaſphemy*, but *rail, revile, ſpeak evil*, &c. In one of the paſſages quoted, a reproachful charge brought even againſt the devil, is called κρισις βλασφημιας ‡, and rendered by them *railing accuſation*. That the word in ſome other places § ought to have been rendered in the ſame general terms, I ſhall afterwards ſhow. But with reſpect to the principal point, that the word comprehends all verbal abuſe, againſt whomſoever uttered, God, angel, man, or devil; as it is univerſally admitted by the learned, it would be loſing time to attempt to prove. The paſſages referred to will be more than ſufficient to all who can read them in the original Greek.

§ 2. BUT it deſerves our notice, and it is principally for this reaſon that I judged it proper to make ſome remarks on the word, that even when βλασφημια refers to reproachful ſpeeches againſt God, and ſo comes nearer the meaning of our word *blaſphemy*; ſtill the primitive notion of this crime has undergone a conderable change in our way of conceiving it. The cauſes it would not perhaps be difficult to inveſtigate, but the effect is undeniable. In theological diſputes nothing is more common, to the great ſcandal of

* 1 Tim. iii. 16. † Matth. xii. 31, 32. xxvii. 39. Mark xv. 29. Luke xxii. 65. xxiii. 39. Rom. iii. 8. xiv. 16. 1 Cor. iv. 13. x. 30. Eph. iv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 4. 14. Jude, 9. 10. Acts vi. 11. 13. 2 Pet. ii. 10, 11. ‡ Jude, 9. § Acts xiii. 45. xviii. 6. xxvi. 11. Col. iii. 8. 1 Tim. i. 13, 2 Tim. iii, 2,

of the Chriſtian name, than the imputation of blaſphemy thrown by each ſide upon the other. The injuſtice of the charge on both ſides will be manifeſt on a little reflection, which it is the more neceſſary to beſtow, as the commonneſs of the accuſation, and the latent, but contagious, motives of employing it, have gradually perverted our conceptions of the thing.

§ 3. It has been remarked already, that the import of the word βλασφημια is *maledicentia*, in the largeſt acception, comprehending all ſorts of verbal abuſe, imprecation, reviling, and calumny. Now let it be obſerved, that when ſuch abuſe is mentioned as uttered againſt God, there is properly no change made on the ſignification of the word; the change is only in the application, that is, in the reference to a different object. The idea conveyed in the explanation now given is always included, againſt whomſoever the crime be committed. In this manner every term is underſtood that is applicable to both God and man. Thus the meaning of the word *diſobey* is the ſame, whether we ſpeak of diſobeying God or of diſobeying man. The ſame may be ſaid of *believe*, *honour*, *fear*, &c. As therefore the ſenſe of the term is the ſame, though differently applied, what is eſſential to conſtitute the crime of detraction in the one caſe, is eſſential alſo in the other. But it is eſſential to this crime as commonly underſtood, when committed by one man againſt another, that there be in the injurious perſon the will or diſpoſition to detract from the perſon abuſed. Mere miſtake in regard to character, eſpecially when the miſtake is not conceived, by him who entertains it, to leſſen the character, nay, is ſuppoſed, however erroneouſly, to exalt it, is never conſtrued by any into the crime of defamation. Now, as blaſphemy is, in its eſſence, the ſame crime, but immenſely aggravated, by being committed againſt an object infinitely ſuperior to man, what is fundamental to the exiſtence of the crime, will be found in this, as in every other ſpecies, which comes under the general name. There can be no blaſphemy, therefore, where there is not an impious purpoſe to derogate from the divine majeſty, and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God.

§ 4. Hence, we muſt be ſenſible of the injuſtice of ſo frequently uſing the odious epithet *blaſphemous* in our controverſial writings: an evil imputable ſolely to the malignity of temper, which a habit of ſuch diſputation rarely fails to produce. Hence it is, that the Arminian and the Calviniſt, the Arian and the Athanaſian, the Proteſtant and the Papiſt, the Jeſuit and the Janſeniſt, throw and retort on each other the unchriſtian reproach. Yet it is no more than juſtice to ſay, that each of the diſputants is ſo far from intending to diminiſh, in the opinion of others, the honour of the Almighty, that he is, on the contrary, fully convinced, that his own principles are better adapted to raiſe it than thoſe of his antagoniſt, and, for that very reaſon, he is ſo ſtrenuous in maintaining them. But to blacken, as much as poſſible, the deſigns of an adverſary, in order the more effectually to render his opinions hateful, is one of the many common, but deteſtable, reſources of theological controvertiſts. It is to be hoped that the ſenſe, not only of the injuſtice of this meaſure but of its inefficacy for producing conviction in the mind of a reaſonable antagoniſt, and of the bad impreſſion it tends to make on the impartial and judicious, in regard both to the arguers and to the argument, will at length induce men to adopt more candid methods of managing their diſputes; and even, when provoked by the calumnious and angry epithets of an oppoſer, not to think of retaliating; but to remember, that they will derive more honour from imitating, as is their duty, the conduct of Him who, when he was reviled, reviled not again.

§ 5. But, after obſerving that this perverſion of the word *blaſphemy* reſults, for the moſt part, from the intemperate heat and violence with which Polemic writers manage their religious conteſts; it is no more than doing juſtice to theologians and eccleſiaſtics (though it may look like a digreſſion), to remark, that this evidence of undue acrimony, is by no means peculiar to them. So uncontrolable is this propenſity in men of violent paſſions, that even ſceptics cannot pretend an entire exemption from it. Some allowances ought doubtleſs to be made for the rage of bigots, inflamed by contradiction, from the infinite conſequence they always aſcribe to their own religious dogmas; but when a reaſoner an inquirer into truth, and, conſequently, a diſpaſſionate and unprejudiced perſon (as doubtleſs ſuch a man as Bolingbroke choſe to be accounted), fall into the ſame abſurdity, adopts the furious language of fanaticiſm, and rails againſt thoſe whoſe theory he combats, calling them *impious blaſphemers*, to what allowance can we juſtly think him intitled? I know of none, except our pity; to which, indeed, a manner, ſo much beneath the dignity of the philoſopher, and unbecoming the patience and ſelf-command implied in cool inquiry, ſeems to give him a reaſonable claim. Since, however, with this defect of diſcernment, candour, and moderation, philoſophers as well as zealots, infidels as well as fanatics, and men of the world as well as prieſts, are ſometimes chargeable, it may not be unreaſonable to beſtow a few reflections on it.

§. 6. First, to recur to analogy, and the reaſon of the thing: I believe there are few who have not ſometimes had occaſion to hear a man warmly, and with the very beſt intentions, commend another, for an action which in reality merited not praiſe but blame. Yet no man would call the perſon who, through ſimplicity, acted this part, a ſlanderer; whether the fact he related of his friend were true or falſe; ſince he ſeriouſly meant to raiſe eſteem of him: for an intention to de-

preciate, is eſſential to the idea of ſlander. To praiſe injudiciouſly, is one thing; to ſlander, is another. The former, perhaps, will do as much hurt to the character, which is the ſubject of it, as the latter: but the merit of human actions depends entirely on the motive. There is a maliciouſneſs in the calumniator, which no perſon who reflects, is in danger of confounding with the unconſcious blundering of a man, whoſe praiſe detracts from the perſon whom he means to honour. The blaſphemer is no other than the calumniator of Almighty God. To conſtitute the crime, it is as neceſſary that this ſpecies of calumny be intentional, as that the other be. He muſt be one, therefore, who, by his impious talk, endeavours to inſpire others with the ſame irreverence towards the Deity, or perhaps, abhorrence of him, which he indulges in himſelf. And though, for the honour of human nature, it is to be hoped, that very few arrive at this enormous guilt, it ought not to be diſſembled, that the habitual profanation of the name and attributes of God, by common ſwearing, is but too manifeſt an approach towards it. There is not an entire coincidence. The latter of theſe vices may be conſidered as reſulting ſolely from the defect of what is good in principle and diſpoſition; the former, from the acquiſition of what is evil in the extreme: but there is a cloſe connection between them, and an inſenſible gradation from the one to the other. To accuſtom one's ſelf to treat the Sovereign of the univerſe with irreverent familiarity, is the firſt ſtep; malignly to arraign his attributes, and revile his providence, is the laſt.

§ 7. BUT it may be ſaid, that an inquiry into the proper notion of βλασφημια, in the ſacred writings, is purely a matter of criticiſm, concerning the import of a word, whoſe ſignification muſt be ultimately determined by ſcriptural uſe. Our reaſonings, therefore, are of no validity, unleſs they are ſupported by fact. True: but it ought to be conſidered, on the other hand, that as the word βλασφημειν, when men are the objects, is manifeſtly uſed for intentional abuſe, the preſumption is, that the ſignification is the ſame, when God is the object. Nay, according to the rules of criticiſm, it is evidence ſufficient, unleſs a poſitive proof could be brought, that the word, in this application, undergoes a change of meaning. In the preſent inſtance, however, it is unneceſſary to recur to the preſumption, as poſitive teſtimony can be produced, that both the verb and the noun have the ſame meaning in theſe different applications.

§ 8. LET it be obſerved then that ſometimes, in the ſame ſentence, the word is applied in common both to divine and to human beings, which are ſpecified as the objects, and conſtrued with it, and ſometimes the word, having been applied to one of theſe, is repeated, in an application to the other; the ſacred writers thereby ſhowing, that the evil is the ſame in kind in both caſes, and that the caſes are diſcriminated ſolely by the dignity of the object. Thus our Lord ſays (as in the common tranſlation), *All manner of blaſphemy* παση βλασφημια, *ſhall be forgiven unto men: but the blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſhall not be forgiven* *. The difference in point of atrociouſneſs is here exceedingly great, the one being repreſented as unpardonable, and the other as what may be pardoned; but this is exhibited as reſulting purely from the infinite diſparity of the objects. The application of the ſame name to the two crimes compared, gives us to underſtand the immenſe diſproportion there is, in reſpect of guilt, between the ſame criminal behaviour, when aimed againſt our fellow-creatures, and when directed againſt the Author of our being. As the Engliſh word *blaſphemy* is not of the ſame extent of ſignification with the Greek, and is not properly applied to any abuſe vented againſt man, it would have been better here to have choſen a common term which would have admitted equally an application to either, ſuch as *ſlander* or *detraction*. The expreſſion of the Evangeliſt Mark, in the parallel place †, is to the ſame purpoſe. Again, in the Acts, *We have heard him ſpeak blaſphemous words*, ρηματα βλασφημα, *againſt Moſes and againſt God* ‡. Like to this is that in the Old Teſtament, where the falſe witneſſes who were ſuborned to teſtify againſt Naboth ſay, *Thou didſt blaſpheme God and the king* §. Though the word in the Septuagint is not βλασφημειν, it is a term which, in that verſion, is ſometimes uſed ſynonymouſly, as indeed are all the terms which in the original denote *curſing*, *reviling*, *defaming*.

§ 9. FURTHER, with the account given above, of the nature of *blaſphemy*, the ſtyle of Scripture perfectly agrees. No errors concerning the divine perfections can be groſſer than thoſe of polytheiſts and idolaters, ſuch as the ancient Pagans. Errors on this, if on any ſubject, are ſurely fundamental. Yet thoſe errors are never in holy writ brought under the demonination of blaſphemy: nor are thoſe who maintain them ever ſtyled blaſphemers. Nay, among thoſe who are no idolators, but acknowledge the unity and ſpirituality of the divine nature (as did all the Jewiſh ſects), it is not ſufficient to conſtitute this crime, that a man's opinions be, in their conſequences, derogatory from the divine majeſty, if they be not perceived to be ſo by him who holds them, and broached on purpoſe to diminiſh men's veneration of God. The opinions of the Sadducees

* Matth. xii. 31. See the paſſage in this tranſlation, and the note upon it. † Mark iii. 28, 29. ‡ Acts vi. ii. § 1 Kings xxi 10.

cees appear in effect to have detracted from the juſtice, the goodneſs, and even the power of the Deity, as their tendency was but too manifeſtly to diminiſh in men the fear of God, and conſequently to weaken their obligations to obey him. Yet neither our Saviour, nor any of the inſpired writers, calls them *blaſphemous*, as thoſe opinions did not appear to themſelves to detract, nor were advanced with the intention of detracting, from the honour of God. Our Lord only ſaid to the Sadducees, *Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God* *. Nay, it does not appear that even their adverſaries the Phariſees, though the firſt who ſeem to have perverted the word (as ſhall be remarked afterwards), and though immoderately attached to their own tenets, ever reproached them as blaſphemers, on account of their erroneous opinions. Nor is indeed the epithet *blaſphemous*, or any ſynonymous term, ever coupled in Scripture (as is common in modern uſe) with *doctrines*, *thoughts*, *opinions*. It is never applied but to words and ſpeeches. *A blaſphemous opinion*, or *blaſphemous doctrine*, are phraſes, which (how familiar ſoever to us) are as unſuitable to the ſcriptural idiom, as a *railing opinion*, or *ſlanderous doctrine*, is to ours.

§ 10. BUT to proceed from what is not, to what is, called *blaſphemy* in Scripture: the firſt divine law publiſhed againſt it, *He that blaſphemeth the name of the Lord* (or Jehovah, as it is in the Hebrew) *ſhall be put to death* †, when conſidered, along with the incident that occaſioned it, ſuggeſts a very atrocious offence in words, no leſs than abuſe or imprecations, vented againſt the Deity. For, in what way ſoever, the crime of the man there mentioned be interpreted, whether as committed againſt the true God, the God of Iſrael, or againſt any of the falſe gods whom his Egyptian father worſhipped, the law in the words now quoted is ſufficiently explicit; and the circumſtances of the ſtory plainly ſhow that the words which he had uſed, were derogatory from the Godhead, and ſhocking to the hearers.

And if we add to this, the only other memorable inſtance, in ſacred hiſtory, namely, that of Rabſhakeh, it will lead us to conclude that it is ſolely a malignant attempt, in words, to leſſen men's reverence of the true God, and, by vilifying his perfections, to prevent their placing confidence in him, which is called in Scripture *blaſphemy*, when the word is employed to denote a ſin committed directly againſt God. This was manifeſtly the attempt of Rabſhakeh when he ſaid, *Neither let Hezekiah make you truſt in the Lord* (the word is Jehovah), *ſaying, Jehovah will ſurely deliver us. Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand of the king of Aſſyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? Have they delivered Samariah out of my hand? who are they among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that Jehovah ſhould deliver Jeruſalem out of mine hand* ‡?.

§ 11. BLASPHEMY, I acknowledge, like every other ſpecies of defamation, may proceed from ignorance combined with raſhneſs and preſumption; but in invariably implies (which is not implied in mere error) an expreſſion of contempt or deteſtation, and a deſire of producing the ſame paſſion in others. As this conduct, however, is more heinous in the knowing than in the ignorant, there are degrees of guilt even in blaſphemy. God's name is ſaid to be blaſphemed among the heathen, through the ſcandalous conduct of his worſhippers. And when Nathan ſaid to David *By this deed thou haſt given occaſion to the enemies of Jehovah to blaſpheme* §, his deſign was evidently to charge on that monarch, a conſiderable ſhare of the guilt of thoſe blaſphemies to which his heinous tranſgreſſion in the matter of Uriah, would give riſe, among their idolatrous neighbours: for here, as in other caſes, the flagrant iniquity of the ſervant, rarely fails to bring reproach on the maſter, and on the ſervice. It is, without doubt, a moſt flagitious kind of blaſphemy whereof thoſe men are guilty who, inſtead of being brought to repentance by the plagues wherewith God viſits them for their ſins, are fired with a monſtrous kind of revenge againſt their Maker, which they vent in vain curſes and impious reproaches. Thus, in the Apocalypſe, we are informed of thoſe who *blaſphemed the God of heaven, becauſe of their pains and their ſores, and repented not of their deeds* ||.

§ 12. IT will perhaps be objected, that even the inſpired penmen of the New Teſtament ſometimes uſe the word with greater latitude than has here been given it. The Jews are ſaid, by the ſacred hiſtorian, *to have ſpoken againſt the things preached by Paul, contradicting and blaſpheming* ¶. And it is ſaid of others of the ſame nation, *When they oppoſed themſelves and blaſphemed* **. Now, as zeal for God and religion was the conſtant pretext of the Jews for vindicating their oppoſition to Chriſtianity, it cannot be imagined they would have thrown out any thing like direct blaſphemy or reproaches againſt God. It may, therefore, be plauſibly urged, that it muſt have been, (if we may borrow a term from the law) ſuch conſtructive blaſphemy, as when we call fundamental errors in things divine, by that odious name. But the anſwer is eaſy. It has been ſhown already, that the Greek word implies no more than to *revile*, *defame*, or *give abuſive language*. As the term is general, and equally

* Matth. xxii. 29. † Lev. xxiv. 16. ‡ 2 Kings xviii. 30, 33, 34, 35. § 2 Sam. xii. 14. || Rev. xvi. 11.
¶ Acts, xiii. 45. ** xviii. 6.

equally applicable, whether God be the object of the abuſe, or man, it ought never to be rendered *blaſpheme*, unleſs when the context manifeſtly reſtrains it to the former application. There is this advantage, if the caſe were dubious, in preſerving the general term, that if God be meant as the object of their reproaches, ſtill the verſion is juſt. In the ſtory of the ſon of the Iſraeliti∫h woman, the terms *curſing God*, and *blaſpheming him* *, are uſed ſynonymouſly; and, in regard to Rabſhakeh's blaſphemy, the phraſes, *to reproach the living God* or *Jehovah*, and to blaſpheme him †, are both uſed in the ſame way: but, on the other hand, if the writer meant abuſe levelled againſt men, to render it blaſpheme is a real miſ-tranſlation, inaſmuch as, by repreſenting the divine majeſty as the object, which the Engliſh word *blaſpheme* always does, the ſenſe is totally altered.

Our tranſlators have, on other occaſions, been ſo ſenſible of this, that in none of the places marked in the margin ‡ have they uſed *blaſpheme*, or any of its conjugates; but, inſtead of it, the words *rail, revile, report ſlanderouſly, ſpeak evil, defame*, though the word in the original is the ſame, nay, in ſome places, where Jeſus Chriſt is the object, they tranſlate it in the ſame manner §. There can be no doubt, that in the two paſſages quoted from the Acts, the Apoſtles themſelves were the objects of the abuſe which fiery zeal prompted their countrymen to throw out againſt the propagators of a doctrine, conſidered by them as ſubverſive of the religion of their fathers. Both paſſages are juſtly rendered by Caſtalio: the firſt, *Judæi contradicebant iis quæ a Paulo dicebantur, reclamantes ac conviciantes*; the ſecond, *Quumque illi reſiſterunt ac maledicerent.*

§ 13. The ſame will ſerve for anſwer to the objection founded on Paul's ſaying of himſelf before his converſion, that he was a *blaſphemer* ‖; the word ought to have been rendered *defamer*. Of this we can make no doubt, when we conſider the honourable teſtimony which this Apoſtle, after his converſion, did not heſitate to give of his own piety when a Jew, *Brethren*, ſaid he, *I have lived in all good conſcience before God* (rather *towards God*, το Θεω not ενωπιον του Θεου) *until this day* ¶. This expreſſion therefore, regards what is ſtrictly called *duty to God*. But could he have made this declaration, if his conſcience had charged him with blaſphemy, of all crimes againſt God the moſt heinous? Should it be aſked, In what ſenſe could he charge himſelf with defamation? Whom did he defame? The anſwer is obvious. Not only the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the head, but the members alſo of the Chriſtian community, both miniſters and diſciples. Not that he conſidered himſelf as guilty of this crime by implication, for diſbelieving that Jeſus is the Meſſiah; for neither Jews nor Pagans are ever repreſented as either blaſphemers or calumniators, merely for their unbelief; but becauſe he was conſcious that his zeal had carried him much further, even to exhibit the author of this inſtitution as an impoſtor and falſe prophet, and his Apoſtles as his accomplices, in maliciouſly impoſing upon the nation, and ſubverting the true religion. That he acted this part, the account given of his proceedings, not to mention this declaration, affords the moſt ample evidence. We are told that he breathed out threatenings and ſlaughter againſt the diſciples **; and he ſays himſelf that he was exceedingly mad againſt them, and even compelled them to join in the abuſe and reproaches ††, of which he accuſes himſelf as ſetting the example. And though I doubt not that in this, Paul acted according to his judgment of things at the time; for he tells us expreſsly that he thought verily with himſelf that he *ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jeſus ‡‡; this ignorance did indeed extenuate his crime, but not excuſe it; for it is not he only who invents, but he alſo who malignantly and raſhly, or without examination and ſufficient evidence, propagates an evil report againſt his neighbour, who is juſtly accounted a defamer.

Nor is the above-mentioned the only place wherein the word has been miſinterpreted *blaſphemer*. We have another example, in the character which the ſame Apoſtle gives of ſome ſeducers who were to appear in the church, and of whom he tells us, that they would *have a form of godlineſs*, but *without the power* §§. Now, blaſphemy is alike incompatible with both; though experience has ſhown, in all ages, that ſlander and abuſe, vented againſt men, however inconſiſtent with the power of godlineſs, are perfectly compatible with its form. Some other places in the New Teſtament, in which the word ought to have been tranſlated in its greateſt latitude, that is, in the ſenſe of defamation, or reviling in general, are marked in the margin ‖‖. Indeed, as was hinted before, it ought always to be ſo, unleſs where the ſcope of the paſſage limits it to that impious defamation, whereof the Deity is the object.

§ 14. I

* Lev. xxiv. 11, 14. † 2 Kings, xix. 4, 16, 22, 23. ‡ Rom. iii. 8. xiv. 6. 1 Cor. iv. 13. x. 30. Eph. iv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 4, 14. 2 Pet. ii. 10, 11. Jude, 9, 10. § Matth. xxvii. 39. Mark xv. 29. Luke xxiii. 39. ‖ 1 Tim. i, 13. ¶ Acts xxiii. 1. ** Acts ix. 1. †† Acts xxvi. 11. ‡‡ Acts xxvi. 9. §§ 2 Tim. ii. 5. ‖‖ Matth. xii. 31. xv. 19. Mark iii. 28, 29. vii. 22. Luke xxii. 65. Col. iii. 8. James ii. 7.

§ 14. I KNOW but one other argument that can be drawn from Scripture, in favour of what I call the controverſial ſenſe of the word *blaſphemy*; that is, as applied to errors, which, in their conſequences, may be thought to derogate from the perfections or providence of God. In this way the Phariſees, oftner than once, employ the term againſt our Lord; and, if their authority were to us a ſufficient warrant, I ſhould admit this plea to be deciſive. But the queſtion of importance to us is, Have we the authority of any of the ſacred writers for this application of the word? Did our Lord himſelf, or any of his Apoſtles, ever retort this charge upon the phariſees? Yet it cannot be denied, that the doctrine then in vogue with them gave, in many things, if this had been a legitimate uſe of the term *blaſphemy*, a fair handle for ſuch recrimination. They made void, we are told, the commandment of God, to make room for their tradition *; and thus in effect, ſet up their own authority, in oppoſition to that of their Creator. They diſparaged the moral duties of the law, in order to exalt poſitive and ceremonial obſervances †. Now this cannot be done by the teachers of religion, without ſome miſrepreſentation of the moral attributes of the Lawgiver, whoſe character is thereby degraded in the minds of the people. Yet there is, no where, the moſt diſtant inſinuation given that, on any of theſe accounts, they were liable to the charge of blaſphemy.

But no ſooner did Jeſus ſay to the paralytic, *Thy ſins are forgiven thee*, than the Scribes laid hold of the expreſſion. *This man blaſphemeth*, ſaid they; *Who can forgive ſins but God‡?* Their plea was, it is an invaſion of the prerogative of God. Grotius obſerves juſtly of this application of the term, *Dicitur hic βλασφημειν, non qui Deo maledicit, ſed qui quod Dei eſt, ſibi arrogat.* Such undoubtedly, was their notion of the matter. But I do not ſee any warrant they had for thus extending the ſignification of the word. In the ſimple and primitive import of the name *blaſphemer*, it could not be more perfectly defined in Latin, than by theſe three words, *qui Deo maledicit*; and, therefore, I cannot agree with the generality of expoſitors, who ſeem to think, that if Jeſus had not been the Meſſiah, or authoriſed of God to declare to men the remiſſion of their ſins, the Scribes would have been right in their verdict. On the contrary, if one unauthoriſed of Heaven, had ſaid what our Lord is recorded to have ſaid to the paralytic, he would not, in my opinion, have been liable to that accuſation; he would have been chargeable with great preſumption, I acknowledge; and if he had been conſcious that he had no authority, he would have been guilty of groſs impiety; but every ſpecies of impiety is not blaſphemy. Let us call things by their proper names. If any of us uſurp a privilege that belongs, excluſively, to another man, or, if we pretend to have his authority, when we have it not, our conduct is very criminal; but nobody would confound this crime with *calumny*. No more can the other be termed *blaſphemy*, eſpecially when it reſults from miſapprehenſion, and is unaccompanied with a malevolent intention, either to depreciate the character, or to defeat the purpoſes of the Almighty. The falſe prophets, who knowingly told lies in the name of God, and pretended a commmiſſion from him, which they had not, were liable to death; but they are nowhere ſaid to blaſpheme, that is, to revile, or to defame, their Maker. Much leſs could it be ſaid of thoſe who told untruths through miſtake, and without any deſign of detracting from God.

This polemic application of the term *blaſphemy* muſt, therefore, have originated in the ſchools of the rabbies, and appears to have been, in time of our Lord and his Apoſtles, in general vogue with the Scribes. Nay, which is exceedingly repugnant to the original import of the name, they even applied it to expreſſions the immediate object whereof is not perſons, but things. Thus, the hiſtorian, in relating the charge brought againſt Stephen, acquaints us§, that *they ſet up falſe witneſſes, which ſaid, This man ceaſeth not to ſpeak blaſphemous words againſt this holy place, and the law*: an application of the word, perhaps till then unexampled. But we need not wonder at this liberty, when we conſider, that the perverſion of the term anſwered for them a double purpoſe; firſt, it afforded them one eaſy expedient for rendering a perſon, whom they diſliked, odious to the people, amongſt whom the very ſuſpicion of blaſphemy excited great abhorrence; ſecondly, it encreaſed their juriſdiction. Blaſphemy was a capital crime, the judgement was in the ſanhedrim, of whom the chief prieſts, and ſome of the Scribes, always made the principal part. The farther the import of the word was extended, the more caſes it brought under their cognizance, and the more perſons into their power. Hence it proceeded, that the word *blaſphemy*, which originally meant a crime no leſs than maliciouſly reviling the Lord of the univerſe, was at length conſtrued to imply the broaching of any tenet, or the expreſſing of any ſentiment (with whatever view it was done), which did not quadrate with the reigning doctrine. For that doctrine, being preſuppoſed to be the infallible will of God, whatever oppoſed it was ſaid by implication, to revile its Author. Such will ever be the caſe, when the principles of human policy are grafted upon religion.

§ 15. WHEN we conſider this, and remark, at the ſame time, with what plainneſs our Lord condemned, in many particulars, both the maxims and the practice

* Matth. xv. 6. Mark vii. 13. † Matth. xxiii. 23. Luke xi. 42. ‡ Matth. ix. 3. Mark ii. 7. § Acts vi. 13.

of the Phariſees, we cannot be ſurpriſed that, on more occaſions than one, that vindictive and envious ſect traduced him to the people, as a perſon chargeable with this infernal guilt, once, indeed, ſome of them proceeded ſo far as to *take up ſtones to ſtone him**: for that was the puniſhment which the law had awarded againſt blaſphemers. But he thought proper then to elude their malice, and, by the anſwer he gave to their unmerited reproach, evidently ſhowed that their application of the term was unſcriptural†. Thoſe who, on other occaſions, watched our Lord to entrap him in his words, ſeem to have had it principally in view to extract either blaſphemy or treaſon from what he ſaid. By the firſt, they could expoſe him to the fury of the populace, or, perhaps, ſubject him to the Jewiſh rulers; and, by the ſecond, render him obnoxious to to the Roman procurator. What uſe they made of both articles at laſt, is known to every body. Nor let it be imagined that, at his trial, the circumſtance, apparently ſlight, of the high prieſt's rending his clothes, when he pronounced him a blaſphmer, an example which muſt have been quickly followed by the whole ſanhedrim, and all within hearing, was not a matter of the utmoſt conſequence, for effecting their malicious purpoſe. We have reaſon to believe, that it contributed not a little, in working ſo wonderful a change in the multitude, and in bringing them to view the man with deteſtation, to whom ſo ſhort while before they were almoſt ready to pay divine honours.

§ 16. But here it may be aſked, 'Can we not then 'ſay, with truth, of any of the falſe teachers, who have 'ariſen in the church, that they vented blaſphemies?' To affirm that we cannot, would, I acknowledge, be to err in the oppoſite extreme. Juſtin Martyr ſays of Marcion‡, that he taught many to blaſpheme the Maker of the world. Now, it is impoſſible to deny the juſtice of this charge, if we admit the truth of what Irenæus§, and others, arffim concerning that that bold hereſiarch, to wit, that he maintained, that the Author of our being, the God of Iſrael, who gave the law by Moſes, and ſpoke by the Prophets, is one who perpetrates injuries, and delights in war, is fickle in his opinions, and inconſiſtent with himſelf. If this repreſentation of Marcion's doctrine be juſt, who would not ſay that he reviled his Creator, and attemped to alienate from him the love and confidence of his creatures? The blaſphemy of Rabſhakeh was only againſt the power of God; Marcion's, not ſo much againſt his power, as againſt his wiſdom and his goodneſs. Both equally manifeſted an intention of ſubverting the faith and veneration of his worſhippers. Now, it is only what can be called a direct attack, not ſuch as is made out by implication, upon the perfections of the Lord of the univerſe, and what clearly diſplays the intention of leſſening men's reverence of him, that is blaſphemy, in the meaning (I ſay not of the rabbies, or of the canoniſts, but) of the ſacred code. In ſhort, ſuch falſe and injurious language, as, when applied to men, would be denominated *reviling*, *abuſing*, *defaming*, is when applied to God *blaſphemy*. The ſame terms in the original tongues are uſed for both; and it would perhaps have been better, for preventing miſtakes, that in modern tongues alſo, the ſame terms were employed. Indeed, if we can depend on the juſtneſs of the accounts which remain of the oldeſt ſectaries, there were ſome who went greater lengths in this way than even Marcion.

§ 17. Before I finiſh this topic, it will naturally occur to enquire, What that is, in particular, which our Lord denominates *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Spirit*‖? It is foreign from my preſent purpoſe, to enter minutely into the diſcuſſion of this difficult queſtion. Let it ſuffice here to obſerve, that this blaſphemy is certainly not of the conſtructive kind, but direct, manifeſt, and malignant. Firſt, it is mentioned as comprehend under the ſame genus with abuſe againſt man, and contradiſtinguiſhed only by the object. Secondly, it is further explained, by being called *ſpeaking againſt*, in both caſes. Ὁς ἂν εἰπῃ λογον κατα τȣ υἱȣ τȣ ἀνθρωπȣ,—ὁς δ' ἂν εἰπῃ κατα τȣ πνευματος τȣ ἁγιȣ. The expreſſions are the ſame, in effect, in all the evangeliſts who mention it, and imply ſuch an oppoſition as is both intentional and malevolent. This cannot have been the caſe of all who diſbelieved the miſſion of Jeſus, and even decried his miracles; many of whom, we have reaſon to think, were afterwards converted by the Apoſtles. But it is not impoſſible, that it may have been the wretched caſe of ſome who, inſtigated by worldly ambition and avarice, have ſlandered what they knew to be the cauſe of God, and, againſt conviction, reviled his work as the operation of evil ſpirits.

§ 18. A late writer¶, more ingenious than Judicious, has, after making juſt remarks on this ſubject, proceeded ſo far as to maintain that there can be no ſuch crime as *blaſphemy*. His argument (by ſubſtituting *defamation* for blaſphemy, *defame* for blaſpheme, and *man* for God) ſerves equally to prove that there is no ſuch crime as defamation, and ſtands thus: 'Defamation preſuppoſes malice; where there is malice, 'there is miſapprehenſion. Now the perſon who, 'miſapprehending another, defames him, does no 'more than put the *man*'s name (I uſe the author's 'praſe-

* John x. 31, 33. † John x. 34, 35, 36. ‡ Apol: 2. § Lib. i. c. 29. ‖ Matth. xii. 31, 32. Mark iii. 28, 29. Luke, xii. 10. ¶ Independent Whig, N° 55.

'phraſeology) to his own miſapprehenſions of him. 'This is ſo far from ſpeaking evil of *the man*, that 'it is not ſpeaking of him at all. It is only ſpeaking 'evil of a wild idea, of a creature of the imagination, 'and exiſting no where but there *.' Form this clear manner of reaſoning the the following corollary, very comfortable to thoſe whom the world has hitherto miſnamed ſlanderers may fairly be deduced. If you have a ſpite againſt any man, you may freely indulge your malevolence, in ſaying of him all the evil you can think of. That you cannot be juſtly charged with defamation, is demonſtrable. If all that you ſay be true, he is not injured by you, and therefore you are no detractor. If the whole or part be falſe, what is falſe does not reach him. Your abuſe in that caſe is levelled againſt an ideal being, a chimera to which you only affix his name (a mere trifle, for a name is but a ſound), but with which the man's real character is not concerned. Therefore, when you have ſaid the worſt that malice and reſentment can ſuggeſt, you are not chargeable with defamation, which was the point to be proved. Thus the argument of that volatile author goes further to emancipate men from all the reſtraints of reaſon and conſcience than, I believe, he himſelf was aware. He only intended by it, as one would think, to releaſe us from the fear of God; it is equally well calculated for freeing us from all regard to man. Are we from this to form an idea of liberty, both ſacred and civil, of which that author affected to be conſidered as the patron and friend; and of the deference he profeſſes to entertain fo the Scriptures and primitive Chriſtianity? I hope not; for he is far from being at all times conſiſtent with himſelf. Of the many evidences which might be brought of this charge, one is, that no man is readier than he to throw the imputation of blaſphemy on thoſe whoſe opinions differ from his own †.

PART III.

Of Schiſm.

THE next term I propoſed to examine critically was σχισμα, *ſchiſm*. The Greek word frequently occurs in the New Teſtament, though it has only once been rendered *ſchiſm* by our tranſlators. However, the frequency of the uſe among theologians has made it a kind of technical term in relation to eccleſiaſtical matters: and the way it has been bandied, as a term of Ignominy from ſect to ſect reciprocally, makes it a matter of ſome conſequence to aſcertain, if poſſible, the genuine meaning it bears in holy writ. In order to this, let us, abſtracting alike from the uncandid repreſentations of all zealous partymen, have recourſe to the oracles of truth, the ſource of light and direction.

§. 2. As to the proper acceptation of the word σχισμα, when applied to objects merely material, there is no difference of ſentiments amongſt interpreters. Every one admits that it ought to be rendered *rent*, *breach*, or *ſeparation*. In this ſenſe it occurs in the Goſpels, as where our Lord ſays, *No man putteth a piece of new cloth to an old garment; for that which is put in to fill it up, taketh from the garment, and the* rent *is made worſe*‡. Κειρον σχισμα γινεται. The ſame phraſe occurs in the parrallel paſſage in Mark§. From this ſenſe it is transferred by metaphor to things incorporeal. Thus it is uſed once and again by the Evangeliſt John, to ſignify a difference in opinion expreſſed in words. Of the conteſt among the Jews, concerning Jeſus, ſome maintaining that he was, others that he was not, the Meſſiah; the ſacred hiſtorian ſays, Σχισμα εν ω τω οχλω εγινετο δι αυτου. *So there was a diviſion among*

Y

* That the reader may be ſatisfied that I do not wrong this author, I ſhall annex, in his own words part of his reaſoning concerning blaſphemy. "As it is a crime that implies malice againſt God, I am not able to conceive how any man can commit it. "A man who knows God, cannot ſpeak evil of him. And a man who knows him not, and reviles him, does therefore revile "him, becauſe he knows him not. He therefore puts the name of God to his own miſapprehenſions of God. This is ſo far from "ſpeaking evil of the Deity, that it is not ſpeaking of the Deity at all. It is only ſpeaking evil of a wild idea, of a creature of the imagination, and exiſting nowhere but there."

† In the dedication of the book, to the lower houſe of convocation, the author adviſes them to clear themſelves from the imputation of maintaining certain ungodly tenets, by expoſing the *blaſphemies* of thoſe of their own body: in N° 23, we are told that falſe zeal talks *blaſphemy* in the name of the Lord; in N° 24, that perſecutors *blaſphemouſly* pretend to be ſerving God; and in N° 27, that it is a kind of *blaſphemy* to attempt to perſuade people that God takes pleaſure in vexing his creatures. More examples of the commiſſion of this impracticable crime might be produced from that author, if neceſſary.

‡ Matth. ix. 16. § Mark ii. 21.

among the people becauſe of him *. Here it is plain the word is uſed in a ſenſe perfectly indifferent; for it was neither in the true opinion ſupported by one ſide, nor in the falſe opinion ſupported by the other, that the *ſchiſm* or diviſion lay, but in the oppoſition of theſe two opinions. In this ſenſe of the word, there would have been no *ſchiſm*, if they had been all of one opinion, whether it had been the true opinion, or the falſe. The word is uſed preciſely in the ſame ſignification by this Apoſtle, in two other places of his Goſpel marked in the margin‡.

§ 3. BUT it is not barely to a declared difference in judgment, that even the metaphorial uſe of the word is confined. As *breach* or *rupture* is the literal import of it in our language; wherever theſe words may be figuratively applied, the term σχισμα ſeems likewiſe capable of an application. It invariably preſuppoſes that among thoſe things whereof it is affirmed, there ſubſiſted an union formerly, and as invariably denotes that the union ſubſiſts no longer. In this manner the Apoſtle Paul uſes the word, applying it to a particular church or Chriſtian congregation. Thus he adjures the Corinthians by the name of the Lord Jeſus, that there be no diviſions or ſchiſms among them ‡, ἱνα μη ᾖ εν υμιν σχισματα; and in another place of the ſame Epiſtle §, he tells them, *I hear that there are diviſions* or ſchiſms *among you*, ακουω σχισματα εν ὑμιν ὑπαρχειν. In order to obtain a proper idea of what is meant by a breach or ſchiſm in this application, we muſt form a juſt notion of that which conſtituted the union whereof the ſchiſm was a violation. Now the great and powerful cement which united the ſouls of Chriſtians, was their mutual love. *Their hearts*, in the emphatical language of holy writ, *were knit together in love* ‖. This had been declared by their Maſter to be the diſtinguiſhing badge of their profeſſion. *By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples, if ye have love one to another* ¶. Their partaking of the ſame baptiſm, their profeſſing the ſame faith, their enjoying the ſame promiſes, and their joining in the ſame religious ſervice, formed a connection merely external and of little ſignificance, unleſs, agreeably to the Apoſtle's expreſſion **, it was rooted and grounded in love. As this, therefore, is the great criterion of the Chriſtian character, and the foundation of the Chriſtian unity, whatever alienates the affections of Chriſtians from one another, is manifeſtly ſubverſive of both, and may conſequently, with the greateſt truth and energy, be denominated *ſchiſm*. It is not ſo much what makes an outward diſtinction or ſeparation (though this alſo may in a lower degree be ſo denominated), as what produces an alienation of the heart, which conſtitutes ſchiſm in the ſenſe of the Apoſtle; for this ſtrikes directly at the vitals of Chriſtianity. Indeed both the evil and the danger of the former, that is, an external ſeparation, is principally to be eſtimated from its influence upon the latter, that is, in producing an alienation of heart; for it is in the union of affection among Chriſtians, that the ſpirit, the life, and the power, of religion, are principally placed.

§ 4. It may be ſaid, does it not rather appear, from the paſſage firſt quoted, to denote ſuch a breach of that viſible unity in the outward order ſettled in their aſſemblies, as reſults from ſome jarring in their religious opinions, and by conſequence in the expreſſions they adopted? This, I own, is what the words in immediate connection, conſidered by themſelves, would naturally ſuggeſt. *I beſeech you, brethren, that ye all ſpeak the ſame thing, and that there be no diviſions* (ſchiſms) *among you, and that ye be perfectly joined together in the ſame mind and in the ſame judgment* ††. It cannot be denied that a certain unanimity, or a declared aſſent to the great articles of the Chriſtian profeſſion, was neceſſary in every one, in order to his being admitted to, and kept in the communion of, the church. But then it muſt be allowed, on the other hand, that thoſe articles were at that time, few, ſimple, and perſpicuous. It is one of the many unhappy conſequences of the diſputes that have ariſen in the church, and of the manner in which theſe have been managed, that ſuch terms of communion have ſince been multiplied, in every part of the Chriſtian world, and not a little perplexed with metaphyſical ſubtleties, and ſcholaſtic quibbles. Whether this evil conſequence was, in its nature, avoidable, or, if it was, in what manner it might have been avoided, are queſtions, though important, foreign to the preſent purpoſe. Certain it is, however, that ſeveral phraſes uſed by the Apoſtles, in relation to this ſubject, ſuch as ὁμοφρονες, το αυτο φρονουντες, and ſome others, commonly underſtood to mean unanimous in opinion, denote, more properly, coinciding in affection, concurring in love, deſire, hatred, and averſion, agreeably to the common import of the verb φρονειν both in ſacred authors and in profane, which is more ſtrictly rendered *to favour*, *to reliſh*, than *to be of opinion*.

§ 5. FURTHER, let it be obſerved, that in matters whereby the eſſentials of the faith are not affected, much greater indulgence to diverſity of opinion was given, in thoſe pure and primitive times, than has been allowed ſince, when the externals, or the form of religion, came to be raiſed on the ruins of the eſſentials, or the power, and a ſuppoſed correctneſs of judgment

* John vii. 43. † John ix 16 x. 19. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 10. § 1 Cor. xi. 18. ‖ Col. ii. 2. ¶ John xiii. 35.
** Eph. iii. 17. †† 1 Cor. i. 10.

judgment made of greater account than purity of heart. In the apoſtolic age, which may be ſtyled the reign of charity, their mutual forbearance in regard to ſuch differences, was at once an evidence, and an exerciſe, of this divine principle. *Him that is weak in the faith*, ſays our Apoſtle, *receive ye, but not to doubtful diſputations. For one believe that he may eat all things; another who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, deſpiſe him that eateth not; and let not him who eateth not, judge him that eateth* *. *One man eſteemeth one day above another: another eſteemeth every day alike.* As to theſe diſputable points, *let every man be fully perſuaded in his own mind* †, and, as far as he himſelf is concerned, act according to his perſuaſion. But he does not permit even him who is in the right, to diſturb his brother's peace, by ſuch unimportant inquiries. *Haſt thou faith?* ſays he; the knowledge and conviction of the truth on the point in queſtion? *Have it to thyſelf before God. Happy is he who condemneth not himſelf in that thing which he alloweth* ‡. And in another place, *Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded; and if any thing ye be otherwiſe minded, God ſhall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheleſs, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the ſame rule, let us mind the ſame thing* §. We are to remember, that *as the kingdom of God is not meat and drink*, ſo neither is it logical acuteneſs in diſtinction, or grammatical accuracy of expreſſion; but it is *righteouſneſs, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghoſt. For he that in theſe things ſerveth Chriſt, is acceptable to God, and approved of men* ‖.

§ 6. Now, if we enquire, by an examination of the context, into the nature of thoſe differences among the Corinthians, to which Paul affixes the name σχισματα, nothing is more certain, than that no cauſe of difference is ſuggeſted, which has any the leaſt relation to the doctrines of religion, or to any opinions that might be formed concerning them. The fault which he ſtigatiſed with that odious appellation, conſiſted then ſolely in an undue attachment to particular perſons, under whom, as chiefs or leaders, the people ſeverally ranked themſelves, and thus, without making ſeparate communions, formed diſtinctions among themſelves, to the manifeſt prejudice of the common bond of charity, claſſing themſelves under different heads. *Now this I ſay*, adds the Apoſtle, *that every one of you ſaith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Chriſt* ¶. It deſerves to be remarked, that of the differences among the Roman converts, concerning the obſervance of days, and the diſtinction of meats, which we ſhould think more material, as they more nearly affect the juſtneſs of religious ſentiments, and the purity of religious practice, the Apoſtle makes ſo little account, that he will not permit them to haraſs one another with ſuch queſtions; but enjoins them to allow every one to follow his own judgement; at the ſame time that he is greatly alarmed at differences among the Corinthians, in which, as they reſult ſolely from particular attachments and perſonal eſteem, neither the faith nor the practice of a Chriſtian appears to have an immediate concern. But it was not without reaſon that he made this diſtinction. The hurt threatened by the latter was directly againſt that extenſive love commanded by the Chriſtian law; but not leſs truly, though more indirectly, againſt the Chriſtian doctrine and manners. By attaching themſelves ſtrongly to human, and conſequently fallible, teachers and guides, they weakened the tie which bound them to the only divine guide and teacher, the Meſſiah, and therefore to that alſo which bound them all one to another.

§ 7. WHAT it was that gave riſe to ſuch diſtinctions in the church of Corinth, we are not informed, nor is it material for us to know. From what follows in the Epiſtle, it is not improbable, that they might have thought it proper in this manner to range themſelves, under thoſe who had been the inſtruments of their converſion to Chriſtianity, or perhaps, thoſe by whom they had been baptiſed, or for whom they had contracted a ſpecial veneration. It is evident, however, that theſe petty differences, as we ſhould account them, had already begun to produce conſequences unfriendly to the ſpirit of the Goſpel; for it is in this point of view ſolely that the Apoſtle conſiders them, and not as having an immediate bad influence on its doctrine. Thus reſuming the ſubject, he ſays, *Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and ſtrife and diviſions, are ye not carnal and walk as men? For while one ſaith, I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal* ** ? Thus it is uncontrovertible, in the firſt place, that the accuſation imports that the Corinthians, by their conduct, had given a wound to charity, and not that they had made any deviation from the faith; and in the ſecond place, that, in the apoſtolical acceptation of the word, men may be ſchiſmatics, or guilty of ſchiſm, by ſuch an alienation of affection from their brethren as violates the internal union ſubſiſting in the hearts of Chriſtians, though there be neither error in doctrine nor ſeparation from communion, and conſequently no violation of external unity in ceremonies and worſhip. Fauſtus, a Manichean biſhop in the fourth century (however remote from truth the leading principles of his party were on more important articles), entertained ſentiments on this ſubject entirely ſcriptural. "Schiſma," ſays he, "niſi fallor, eſt eadem opinantem atque eo-

* Rom. xiv. 1, 2, 3. † Rom. xiv. 5. ‡ Rom. xiv. 22. § Phil. iii. 15, 16. ‖ Rom. xiv. 17, 18.
¶ 1 Cor. i, 12. ** 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.

" dem ritu colentem quo cæteri, ſolo congregationis " delectari diſſidio." Fauſt. l. xx. C. iii. ap. Auguſt.

§ 8. AFTER ſo clear a proof of the import of the term, if it ſhould be thought of conſequence to allege in confirmation what muſt be acknowledged to be more indirect, ye may conſider the only other paſſage in which the term is uſed in the New Teſtament, and applied metaphorically to the human body. In the ſame Epiſtle, the Apoſtle having ſhown that the different ſpiritual gifts beſtowed on Chriſtians, rendered them mutually ſubſervient, and made all, in their ſeveral ways, harmoniouſly contribute to the good of the Chriſtian community, gives a beautiful illuſtration of this doctrine from the natural body, the different functions of whoſe members admirably conduce to the benefit and ſupport of one another, and to the perfection and felicity of the whole. He concludes in theſe words: *God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked, that there ſhould be no ſchiſm in the body,* ἵνα μὴ ᾖ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι, *but that the members ſhould have the ſame care one for another: and whether one member ſuffer, all the members ſuffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it* *. It is obvious that the word *ſchiſm* is here employed to ſignify, not a ſeparation from the body, ſuch as is made by amputation or fracture, but ſuch a defect in utility and congruity, as would deſtroy what he conſiders as the mutual ſympathy of the members, and their care one of another.

§ 9. As to the diſtinctions on this ſubject, which in after-times obtained among theologians, it is proper to remark, that error in doctrine was not ſuppoſed eſſential to the notion of ſchiſm; its diſtinguiſhing badge was made ſeparation from communion in religious offices, inſomuch that the words *ſchiſmatic* and *ſeparatiſt*, have been accounted ſynonymous. By this, divines commonly diſcriminate *ſchiſm* from *hereſy*, the eſſence of which laſt is repreſented as conſiſting in an erroneous opinion obſtinately maintained, concerning ſome fundamental doctrine of Chriſtianity; and that whether it be accompanied with ſeparation in reſpect of the ordinances of religion, or not. We have now ſeen that the former definition does not quadrate with the application of the word in the New Teſtament, and that *ſchiſm*, in ſcriptural uſe, is one thing, and *ſchiſm*, in eccleſiaſtical uſe, another.

PART IV.

Of Hereſy.

LET us now enquire with the ſame freedom and impartiality, into the ſcriptural uſe of the other term. The Greek word αἵρεσις, which properly imports no more than *election*, or *choice*, was commonly employed by the Helleniſt Jews, in our Saviour's time, when the people were much divided in their religious ſentiments, to denote, in general, any branch of the diviſion, and was nearly equivalent to the Engliſh words, *claſs*, *party*, *ſect*. The word was not, in its earlieſt acceptation, conceived to convey any reproach in it, ſince it was indifferently uſed, either of a party approved, or of one diſapproved, by the writer. In this way it occurs ſeveral times in the Acts of the Apoſtles, where it is always, (one ſingle paſſage excepted) rendered *ſect*. We hear alike of the ſect of the Sadducees, αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδυκαίων †, and of the ſect of the Phariſees, αἵρεσις τῶν Φαρισαίων ‡. In both places the term is adopted by the hiſtorian, purely for diſtinction's ſake, without the leaſt appearance of intention to convey either praiſe, or blame. Nay, on one occaſion, Paul, in the defence he made for himſelf before king Agrippa, where it was manifeſtly his intention to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their ſyſtem the preference to every other ſyſtem of Judaiſm, both in ſoundneſs of doctrine, and purity of morals, expreſſes himſelf thus: *My manner of life from my youth, which was at the firſt among mine own nation at Jeruſalem, know all the Jews, which knew me from the beginning, if they would teſtify; that after the moſt ſtraiteſt ſect of our religion,* κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας, *I lived a Phariſee* §.

§ 2. THERE is only one paſſage in that hiſtory, wherein there is an appearance that ſomething reproachful is meant to be conveyed under the name αἵρεσις. It is in the accuſation of Paul, by the orator Tertullus, on the part of the Jews, before the gover-

nor.

* 1 Cor. xii. 24, 25, 26. † Acts v. 17. ‡ Acts xv. 5. § Acts xxvi. 4 5.

nor Felix; where, amongſt other things, we have theſe words: *We have found this man a peſtilent fellow, and a mover of ſedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the ſect of the Nazarenes,* πρωτοστατην τε της των Ναζωραιων αιρεσεως *. I ſhould not, however, have imagined that any part of the obloquy lay in the application of the word laſt mentioned, if it had not been for the notice which the Apoſtle takes of it, in his anſwer. *But this I confeſs unto thee, that after the way which they call hereſy,* ην λεγουσιν αιρεσιν, *ſo worſhip I the God of my fathers* †.

§ 3. HERE, by the way, I muſt remark a great impropriety in the Engliſh tranſlation, though in this, I acknowledge, it does but follow the Vulgate. The ſame word is rendered one way in the charge brought againſt the priſoner, and another way in his anſwer for himſelf. The conſequence is that, though nothing can be more appoſite than his reply, in this inſtance, as it ſtands in the original, yet nothing can appear more foreign than this paſſage, in the two verſions above mentioned. The Apoſtle ſeems to defend himſelf againſt crimes, of which he is not accuſed. In both places, therefore, the word ought to have been tranſlated in the ſame manner, whether *hereſy* or *ſect*. In my judgment, the laſt term is the only proper one; for the word *hereſy*, in the modern acceptation, never ſuits the import of the original word, as uſed in Scripture. But, when one attends to the very critical circumſtances of the Apoſtle at this time, the difficulty in accounting for his having conſidered it as a reproach to be denominated of a *ſect*, diſclaimed by the whole nation, inſtantly vaniſhes. Let it be remembered, firſt, that, ſince the Jews had fallen under the power of the Romans, their ancient national religion had not only received the ſanction of the civil powers for the continuance of its eſtabliſhment in Judea, but had obtained a toleration in other parts of the empire; ſecondly, that Paul is now pleading before a Roman governor, a Pagan, who could not well be ſuppoſed to know much of the Jewiſh doctrine, worſhip, or controverſies; and that he had been arraigned by the rulers of his own nation, as belonging to a turbulent and upſtart ſect: for in this way they conſidered the Chriſtians, whom they reproachfully named Nazarenes. The natural conſequence of this charge, with one who underſtood ſo little of their affairs as Felix, was to make him look upon the priſoner as an apoſtate from Judaiſm, and, therefore, as not entitled to be protected, or even tolerated, on the ſcore of religion. Againſt a danger of this kind, it was of the utmoſt importance to our Apoſtle to defend himſelf.

§ 4. ACCORDINGLY, when he enters on this part of the charge, how ſolicitous is he to prove, that his belonging to that *ſect*, did not imply any defection from the religion of his anceſtors; and thus to prevent any miſtaken judgment, on this article of his arraignment, into which a heathen judge muſt have otherwiſe unavoidably fallen. His own words will, to the attentive, ſuperſede all argument or illuſtration: *But this I confeſs to thee, that after the way which they call a ſect, ſo worſhip I;* Whom? No new divinity, but, on the contrary, *the God of our fathers:* he adds, in order the more effectually to remove every ſuſpicion of apoſtacy, *Believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets; and have the ſame hope towards God, which they themſelves alſo entertain, that there ſhall be a reſurrection of the dead, both of the juſt and of the unjuſt* ‡. Nothing could have been more ridiculous, than for the Apoſtle ſeriouſly to defend his doctrine againſt the charge of heterodoxy, before an idolater and polytheiſt, who regarded both him and his accuſers as ſuperſtitious fools, and conſequently, as, in this reſpect, preciſely on a footing; but it was entirely pertinent in him to evince, before a Roman magiſtrate, that his faith and mode of worſhip, however much traduced by his enemies, were neither eſſentially different from, nor any way ſubverſive of, that religion which the ſenate and people of Rome were ſolemnly engaged to protect; and that therefore he was not to be treated as an apoſtate, as his adverſaries, by that article of accuſation, that he was of the ſect of the Nazarenes, ſhowed evidently that they deſired he ſhould. Thus the Apoſtle, with great addreſs, refutes the charge of having revolted from the religious inſtitution of Moſes, and, at the ſame time, is ſo far from diſclaiming, that he glories in the name of a follower of Chriſt.

§ 5. THERE is only one other place, in this hiſtory, in which the word occurs, namely, where the Jews at Rome (for whom Paul had ſent on his arrival), ſpeaking of the Chriſtian ſociety, addreſs him in theſe words: *But we deſire to hear of thee what thou thinkeſt; for as concerning this ſect,* περι μεν γαρ της αιρεσεως ταυτης, *we know that it is every where ſpoken againſt* §. There cannot be a queſtion, here, of the propriety of rendering the word αιρεσις, *ſect*, a term of a middle nature, not neceſſarily implying either good or bad. For, as to the diſpoſition wherein thoſe Jews were at this time, it is plain, they did not think themſelves qualified to pronounce either for or againſt it, till they ſhould give Paul, who patronized it, a full hearing. This they were willing to do; and, therefore, only acquainted him, in general, that they found it to be

2

* Acts xxiv. 5. † Acts xxiv. 14. ‡ Acts xxiv. 14, 15. § Acts xxviii. 22.

a party that was univerſally decried. Thus, in the hiſtorical part of the New Teſtament, we find the word αἱρεσις employed to denote *ſect*, or *party*, indiſcriminately, whether good or bad. It has no neceſſary reference to opinions, true or falſe. Certain it is, that ſects are commonly, not always, cauſed by difference in opinion, but the term is expreſſive of the effect only, not of the cauſe.

§ 6. In order to prevent miſtakes, I ſhall here further obſerve, that the word *ſect*, among the Jews, was not, in its application, entirely coincident with the ſame term as applied by Chriſtians to the ſubdiviſions ſubſiſting among themſelves. We, if I miſtake not, invariably uſe it of thoſe who form ſeparate communions, and do not aſſociate with one another in religious worſhip and ceremonies. Thus we call Papiſts, Lutherans, Calviniſts, different ſects, not ſo much on account of their differences in opinion, as becauſe they have eſtabliſhed to themſelves different fraternities, to which, in what regards public worſhip, they confine themſelves, the ſeveral denominations above mentioned having no intercommunity with one another in ſacred matters. High church and low church we call only parties, becauſe they have not formed ſeparate communions. Great and known differences in opinion, when followed by no external breach in the ſociety, are not conſidered with us as conſtituting diſtinct ſects, though their differences in opinion may give riſe to mutual averſion. Now, in the Jewiſh ſects (if we except the Samaritans), there were no ſeparate communities erected. The ſame temple, and the ſame ſynagogues, were attended alike by Phariſees and by Sadducees. Nay, there were often of both denominations in the Sanhedrim, and even in the prieſthood.

Another difference was, that the name of the ſect was not applied to all the people who adopted the ſame opinions, but ſolely to the men of eminence among them, who were conſidered as the leaders and inſtructors of the party. The much greater part of the nation, nay, the whole populace, received implicitly the doctrine of the Phariſees, yet Joſephus never ſtyles the common people *Phariſees*, but only followers and admirers of the Phariſees, Nay, this diſtinction appears ſufficiently from ſacred writ. *The Scribes and Phariſees*, ſays our Lord*, *ſit in Moſes' ſeat*. This could not have been ſaid ſo generally, if any thing further had been meant by *Phariſees*, but the teachers and guides of the party. Again, when the officers ſent by the chief prieſts to apprehend our Lord, returned without bringing him, and excuſed themſelves by ſaying, *Never man ſpake like this man*; they were aſked, *Have any of the rulers or of the Phariſees believed on him*†? Now, in our way of uſing words, we ſhould be apt to ſay, that all his adherents were of the Phariſees; for the Phariſaical was the only popular doctrine. But it was not to the followers, but to the leaders, that the name of the ſect was applied. Here, however, we muſt except the Eſſenes, who, as they all, of whatever rank originally, entered into a ſolemn engagement, whereby they confined themſelves to a peculiar mode of life, which, in a great meaſure, ſecluded them from the reſt of mankind, were conſidered almoſt in the ſame manner as we do the Benedictines or Dominicans, or any order of monks or friars among the Romaniſts.

Joſephus, in the account he has given of the Jewiſh ſects, conſiders them all as parties who ſupported different ſyſtems of philoſophy, and has been not a little cenſured for this, by ſome critics. But, as things were underſtood then, this manner of conſidering them was not unnatural. Theology, morality, and queſtions regarding the immortality of the ſoul, and a future ſtate, were principal branches of their philoſophy. "Philoſophia," ſays Cicero‡, "nos "primum ad deorum cultum, deinde ad jus hominum "quod ſitum eſt in generis humani ſocietate, tum ad "modeſtiam, magnitudinemque animi erudivit: ea- "demque ab animo tanquam ad oculis, caliginem diſ- "pulit, ut omnia ſupera, infera, prima, ultima, me- "dia, videremus." Beſides, as it was only men of eminence qualified to guide and inſtruct the people, who were dignified with the title, either of Phariſee or of Sadducee, there was nothing ſo analogous among the Pagans, as their different ſects of philoſophers, the Stoics, the Academics, and the Epicureans, to whom alſo the general term αἱρεσις was commonly applied. Epiphanus, a Chriſtian writer of the fourth century, from the ſame view of things with Joſephus, reckons, among the ἁιρεσεις, ſects, or hereſies, if you pleaſe to call them ſo, which aroſe among the Greeks, before the coming of Chriſt, theſe claſſes of philoſophers, the Stoics, the Platoniſts, the Pythagoreans, and the Epicureans. Of this writer it may alſo be remarked, that in the firſt part of his work, he evidently uſes the word αἱρεσις in all the latitude in which it had been employed by the ſacred writers, as ſignifying ſect or party of any kind, and without any note of cenſure. Otherwiſe he would never have numbered Judaiſm, whoſe origin he derives from the command which God gave to Abraham to circumciſe all the males of his family, among the original hereſies. Thus, in laying down the plan of his work, he ſays, Εν τω μι πρωτω βιβλιω πρωτη τομη αἱρεσεις εικοσιν, αἱ εισιν ἀιδε, βαρβαρισμος, σκυθισμος, ἑλληνισμος, ιουδαισμος, κ. τ. ἑ. This only by the way.

§ 7. But,

* Matth. xxiii. 2. † John vii. 48. ‡ Tuſcul. Quæſt. lib. I.

§ 7. But, it may be aſked, is not the acception of the word, in the Epiſtles, different from what it has been obſerved to be in the hiſtorical books of the New Teſtament? Is it not, in the former, invariably uſed in a bad ſenſe, as denoting ſomething wrong, and blameable? That in thoſe, indeed, it always denotes ſomething faulty, or even criminal, I am far from diſputing: nevertheleſs, the acceptation is not materially different from that in which it always occurs in the Acts of the apoſtles. In order to remove the apparent inconſiſtency in what has been now advanced, let it be obſerved, that the word *ſect* has always ſomething relative in it; and, therefore, in different applications, though the general import of the term be the ſame, it will convey a favourable idea, or an unfavourable, according to the particular relation it bears. I explain myſelf by examples. The word *ſect* may be uſed along with the proper names, purely by way of diſtinction from another party of a different name: in which caſe the word is not underſtood to convey either praiſe or blame. Of this we have examples in the phraſes above quoted, the ſect of the Phariſees, the ſect of the Sadducees, the ſect of the Nazarenes. In this way we may ſpeak of a ſtrict ſect, or a lax ſect, or even of a good ſect, or a bad ſect. If any thing reprehenſible or commendable be ſuggeſted, it is not ſuggeſted by the term ſect, αιρεσις, but by the words conſtrued with it. Again, it may be applied to a formed party in a community, conſidered in reference to the whole. If the community, of which the ſect is a part, be of ſuch a nature as not to admit this ſubdiviſion without impairing and corrupting its conſtitution, to charge them with ſplitting into ſects, or forming parties, is to charge them with corruption, in what is moſt eſſential to them as a ſociety. Hence ariſes all the difference there is in the word, as uſed in the hiſtory, and as uſed in the Epiſtles of Peter and Paul; for theſe are the only Apoſtles who employ it. In the hiſtory, the reference is always of the firſt kind; in the Epiſtles, always of the ſecond. In theſe the Apoſtles addreſs themſelves only to Chriſtians, and are not ſpeaking of ſects without the church, but either reprehending them for, or warning them againſt forming ſects among themſelves, to the prejudice of charity, to the production of much miſchief within their community, and of great ſcandal to the unconverted world without. So Paul's words to the Corinthians were underſtood by Chryſoſtom, and other ancient expoſitors. In both applications, however, the radical import of the word is the ſame.

§ 8. But even here, it has no neceſſary reference to doctrine, true or falſe. Let us attend to the firſt paſſage, in which it occurs in the Epiſtles, and we ſhall be fully ſatisfied of the truth of this remark. It follows one quoted in Part Third of this Diſſerta- *For there muſt be alſo hereſies among you* *. δει γαρ και αιρεσεις εν υμιν ειναι. Ye muſt alſo have ſects amongſt you. It is plain, that where he reproves under the name σχισματα, in the former verſe, is in effect the ſame with what he here denominates αιρεσεις. Now, the term σχισμα, I have ſhown already to have there no relation to any erroneous tenet, but ſolely to undue regards to ſome individual teachers, to the prejudice of others and of the common cauſe. In another paſſage of this Epiſtle, where ſpeaking of the very ſame reprehenſible conduct, he uſes the words ſtrife and factions, εριδες και διχοστασιαι †, words nearly coincident with σχισματα και αιρεσεις; his whole aim in theſe reprehenſions is well expreſſed in theſe words *that ye might learn in us* (that is, in himſelf and Apollos, whom he had named, for example's ſake), *not to think of men above that which is written*, above what Scripture warrants, *that no one of you be puffed up for one*, make your boaſt of one, *againſt another* ‡.

§ 9. It may be ſaid, Does not this explanation repreſent the two words *ſchiſm* and *hereſy* as ſynonymous? that there is a great affinity in their ſignifications is manifeſt, but they are not convertible terms. I do not find that the word σχισμα is ever applied in holy writ to a formed party, to which the word αιρεσις is commonly applied. I underſtand them in the Epiſtles of this Apoſtle, as expreſſive of different degrees of the ſame evil. An undue attachment to one part, and a conſequent alienation of affection from another part, of the Chriſtian community, comes under the denomination of σχισμα. When this diſpoſition has proceeded ſo far as to produce an actual party or faction among them, this effect is termed αιρεσις. And it has been remarked, that even this term was at that time currently applied, when matters had not come to an open rupture and ſeparation, in point of communion. There was no appearance of this, at the time referred to among the Corinthians. And even in Judaiſm, the Phariſees and the Sadducees, the two principal ſects, nay, the only ſects mentioned in the Goſpel, and (which is ſtill more extraordinary) more widely different in their religious ſentiments than any two Chriſtian ſects, ſtill joined together, as was but juſt now obſerved, in all the offices of religious ſervice, and had neither different prieſts and miniſters, nor ſeparate places for ſocial worſhip, the reading of the law or the obſervance of the ordinances.

§ 10. In

* 1 Cor. xi. 19. † Cor. iii. 3. ‡ 1 Cor. iv. 6.

§ 10. It will perhaps be ſaid that in the uſe at leaſt which the Apoſtle Peter has made of this word, it muſt be underſtood to include ſome groſs errors ſubverſive of the very foundations of the faith. The words in the common verſion are, *But there were falſe prophets alſo among the people, even as there ſhall be falſe teachers among you, who privily ſhall bring in damnable hereſies, even denying the lord that bought them, and bring upon themſelves ſwift deſtruction* *. That the Apoſtle in this paſſage foretells that there will ariſe ſuch αἱρεσεις, ſects or factions, as will be artfully and ſurreptitiouſly formed by teachers who will entertain ſuch pernicious doctrines, is moſt certain; but there is not the leaſt appearance that this laſt character was meant to be implied in the word αἱρεσεις. So far from it, that this character is ſubjoined, as additional information concering, not the people ſeduced, or the party, but the ſeducing teachers; for it is of them only (though one would judge differently from our verſion) that what is contained in the latter part of the verſe is affirmed. The words in the original are, Εν υμιν εσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι, οιτινες παρεισαξουσιν αἱρεσεις απωλειας, και τον αγορασαντα αυτους δεσποτην αρνουμενοι, επαγοντες ἑαυτοις ταχινην απωλειαν. Obſerve it is αρνουμενοι and επαγοντες, in the maſculine gender and nominative caſe, agreeing with ψευδοδιδασκαλοι, not αρνουμενας and επαγωσας in the feminine gender and accuſative caſe, agreeing with αἱρεσεις. Again, if the word αἱρεσεις did not imply the effect produced, ſects or factions, but the opinions taught whether true or falſe, which are often, not always, the ſecret ſpring of diviſion, he would probably have expreſſed himſelf in this manner. ψευδοδιδασκαλοι οιτινες διδαξουσι αρεσεις απωλειας, who will teach damnable, or rather deſtructive, hereſies; for doctrine of every kind, ſound and unſound, true and falſe, is properly ſaid to be taught: but neither here, nor any where elſe in Scripture, I may ſafely add, nor in any of the writings of the two firſt centuries, do we ever find the word αἱρεσις conſtrued with διδασκω, κηρυσσω, or any word of like import, or an opinion, true or falſe, denominated αἱρεσις. Theſe are, therefore, two diſtinct and ſeparate evils in thoſe falſe teachers of which the apoſtle here gives warning. One is, their making diviſion, by forming to themſelves ſects or parties of adherents; the other is, the deſtructive principles they will entertain, and, doubtleſs, as they find occaſion, diſſeminate among their votaries.

§ 11. The only other paſſage in which the word αἱρεσις occurs in the New Teſtament, is where Paul numbers αἱρεσεις, *ſects*, among the works of the fleſh †, and very properly ſubjoins them to διχοστασιαι, *factions*, as the word ought to be rendered, according to the ſenſe in which the Apoſtle always uſes it. Such diſtinctions and diviſions among themſelves, he well knew, could not fail to alienate affection and infuſe animoſity. Hence we may learn to underſtand the admonition of the Apoſtle, *A man that is a heretic*, αἱρετικον ανθρωπον, *after the firſt and ſecond admonition reject, knowing that he that is ſuch, is ſubverted and ſinneth, being condemned of himſelf* ‡. It is plain, from the character here given, as well as from the genius of the language, that the word αἱρετικος in this place does not mean a member of an αἱρεσις or ſect, who may be unconſcious of any fault, and ſo is not equivalent to our word *ſectary*; much leſs does it anſwer to the Engliſh word *heretic*, which always implies one who entertains opinions in religion not only erroneous, but pernicious; whereas we have ſhown that the word αἱρεσις, in ſcriptural uſe, has no neceſſary connection with opinion at all. Its immediate connection is with diviſion or diſſenſion, as it is thereby that ſects and parties are formed. Αἱρετικος ανθρωπος, muſt therefore mean one who is the founder of a ſect, or at leaſt has the diſpoſition to create αἱρεσεις, or ſects, in the community, and may properly be rendered *a factious man*. This verſion perfectly coincides with the ſcope of the place, and ſuits the uniform import of the term αἱρεσις, from which it is derived. The admonition here given to Titus is the ſame, though differently expreſſed, with that he had given to the Romans, when he ſaid, *mark them which cauſe diviſions*, διχοστασιας ποιουντας, make parties or factions, *and avoid them* §. As far down indeed as the fifth century, and even lower, error alone, however groſs, was not conſidered as ſufficient to warrant the charge of hereſy. Malignity, or perverſeneſs of diſpoſition, was held eſſential to this crime, Hence the famous adage of Auguſtine, "Errare poſſum, hæreticus eſſe nolo;" which plainly implies that no error in judgment, on any article, of what importance ſoever, can make a man a heretic, where there is not pravity of will. To this ſentiment even the ſchoolmen have ſhown regard in their definitions, "Hereſy," ſay they, "is an opinion "maintained with obſtinacy againſt the doctrine of the church." But if we examine a little their reaſoning on the ſubject, we ſhall quickly find the qualifying phraſe, *maintained with obſtinacy*, to be mere words which add nothing to the ſenſe: for if what they account the church have declared againſt the opinion, a man's obſtinacy is concluded from barely maintaining the opinion, in what way ſover he maintain it, or from what motives ſoever he be actuated. Thus mere miſtake is made at length to incur the reproach originally levelled againſt an aſpiring factious temper, which would ſacrifice the deareſt intereſts of ſociety to its own ambition.

§ 12. I cannot omit taking notice here by the way, that

* 2 Pet. ii. 1. † Gal. v. 20. ‡ Tit. iii. 10, 11. § Rom. xvi. 17.

that the late Dr. Foſter, an eminent Engliſh diſſenting miniſter, in a ſermon he preached on this ſubject, has, in my opinion, quite miſtaken the import of the term. He had the diſcernment to diſcover that the characters annexed would not ſuit the common acceptation of the word *heretic*; yet he was ſo far miſled by that acceptation, as to think that error in doctrine muſt be included as part of the deſcription, and therefore defined a *heretic* in the Apoſtle's ſenſe, "a perſon who, to "make himſelf conſiderable, propagates falſe and per-"nicious doctrine, knowing it to be ſuch." Agreeably to this notion, the anonymous Engliſh tranſlator renders with his uſual freedom ἁμαρτανει ων αυτοκατακριτος, *knows in his own conſcience that his tenets are falſe.* To Foſter's explanation there are inſuperable objections. Firſt, it is not agreeable to the rules of criticiſm, to aſſign, without any evidence from uſe, a meaning to a concrete term which does not ſuit the ſenſe of the abſtract. Αιρεσις is the abſtract, αιρετικος the concrete. If αιρεσις could be ſhown, in any inſtance, to mean the profeſſion and propagation of opinions not believed by him who profeſſes and propagates them, I ſhould admit that αιρετικος might denote the profeſſor or propagator of ſuch opinions. But it is not pretended that αιρεσις, in any uſe, ſcriptural, claſſical, or eccleſiaſtical, ever bore that meaning: there is therefore a very ſtrong probability againſt the ſenſe given by that author to the word αιρετικος. Secondly, this word, though it occurs but once in Scripture, is very common in ancient Chriſtian writers, but has never been ſaid, in any one of them, to bear the meaning which the Doctor has here fixed upon it. Thirdly, the apoſtolical precept in this way explained is of little or no uſe. Who can know whether a man's belief in the opinions profeſſed by him, be ſincere or hypocritical? Titus, you may ſay, had the gift of diſcerning ſpirits, and therefore might know. Was the precept, after his lifetime, to be of no ſervice in the church? This I think incredible, eſpecially as there is no other direction in the chapter, or even in the Epiſtle which requires a ſupernatural gift to enable men to follow. To what purpoſe enjoin us to av id a heritec, if it be impoſſibie without a miracle to know him? In fine, though I would not ſay that ſuch a ſpecies of hypocriſy as Foſter makes eſſential to the character, has never appeared, I am perſuaded, it very rarely appears. It is the natural tendency of vanity and ambition to make a man exert himſelf in gaining proſelytes to his own notions, however trifling, and however raſhly taken up. But it is not a natural effect of this paſſion to be zealous in promoting opinions which the promoter does not believe, and to the propagation of which he has no previous inducement from intereſt. It is ſufficient to vindicate the application of the term αυτοκατακριτος, or *ſelf-condemned*, that a factious or turbulent temper, like any other vicious diſpoſition, can never be attended with peace of mind, but, in ſpite of all the influence of ſelf-deceit, which is not greater in regard to this than in regard to other vices, muſt, for the mortal wounds it gives to peace and love, often be diſquieted by the ſtings of conſcience. In ſhort, the αιρετικος, when that term is applied to a perſon profeſſing Chriſtianity, is the man who, either from pride, or from motives of ambition or intereſt, is led to violate theſe important precepts of our Lord, Υμεις δε μη κληθητε ραββι· εις γαρ εστιν υμων ο διδασκαλος ο Χριστος· μηδε κληθητε καθηγηται· εις γαρ υμων εστιν ο καθηγητης, ο Χριστος: which I render thus; *But as for you, aſſume not the title of rabbi; for ye have only one teacher, the Meſſiah: neither aſſume the title of leaders, for ye have only one leader, the Meſſiah**.

§ 13. It deſerves further to be remarked, that, in the earlier ages of the church, after the finiſhing of the canon, the word αιρετικος was not always limited (as the word *heretic* is in modern uſe) to thoſe who, under ſome form or other, profeſs Chriſtianity. We at preſent invariably diſtinguiſh the *heretic* from the *infidel*. The firſt is a corrupter of the Chriſtian doctrine, of which he profeſſes to be a believer and a friend; the ſecond a declared unbeliever of that doctrine, and conſequently an enemy: whereas, in the times I ſpeak of, the head of a faction of religion, or in ethics (for the term ſeems not to have been applied at firſt to the inferior members), the founder, or at leaſt a principal promoter of a ſect or party, whether within or without a church; that is, whether of thoſe who called themſelves the diſciples of Chriſt, or of thoſe who openly denied him, was indiſcriminately termed αιρετικος.

The not attending to this difference in the ancient application of the word, has given riſe to ſome blunders and apparent contradictions in eccleſiaſtic hiſtory; in conſequence of which, the early writers have been unjuſtly charged with confuſion and inconſiſtency in their accounts of things; when in fact the blunders imputed to them by more modern authors, have ariſen ſolely from an ignorance of their language. We confine their words by an uſage of our own, which did not obtain in their time, though it came gradually to obtain ſome ages afterwards. Hence Doſitheus, Simon Magus, Menander, and ſome others, are commonly ranked among the ancient heretics; though nothing can be more evident, from the accounts given by the moſt early writers, who ſo denominate them, than that they were deniers of Jeſus Chriſt in every ſenſe, and avowed oppoſers of the goſpel. Doſitheus gave himſelf out† to his countrymen, the Samaritans, for the Meſſiah promiſed by Moſes. Simon Magus, as we learn from holy writ‡, was baptized; but that,

* Math. xxiii. 8. 10. † Orig. adv. Celſ. lib. I. ‡ Acts viii. 13.

after the rebuke which he received from Peter, instead of repenting, he apostatized, the uniform voice of antiquity puts beyond a question. Origen says expressly*, "The Simonians by no means acknowledge Jesus to be "the Son of God; on the contrary, they call Simon "the power of God." Accordingly, they were never confounded with the Christians in the time of persecution, or involved with them in any trouble or danger†. Justin Martyr is another evidence of the same thing‡; as is also Irenæus, in the account which in his treatise against heresies, he gives§ of Simon and his disciple Menander. So is likewise Epiphanius. From them all it appears manifestly, that the above-named persons were so far from being, in any sense, followers of Jesus Christ, that they presumed to arrogate to themselves his distinguishing titles and prerogatives, and might therefore be more justly called Antichrists than Christians. The like may be said of some other ancient sects which, through the same mistake of the import of the word, are commonly ranked among the heresies which arose in the church. Such were the *Ophites*, of whom Origen acquaints us, that they were so far from being christians, that our Lord was reviled by them as much as by Celsus, and that they never admitted any one into their society, till he had vented curses against Jesus Christ‖.

Mosheim, sensible of the impropriety of classing the declared enemies of Christ among the *heretics*, as the word is now universally applied, and, at the same time, afraid of appearing to contradict the unanimous testimony of the three first centuries, acknowledges that they cannot be suitably ranked with those sectaries who sprang up within the church, and apologizes, merely from the example of some moderns who thought as he did, for his not considering those ancient party leaders in the same light wherein the early ecclesiastic authors, as he imagines, had considered them. But he has not said any thing to account for so glaring an inaccuracy, not of one or two but of all the primitive writers who have taken notice of those sects. For even those who deny that they were Christians, call them *heretics*¶. Now, I will take upon me to say, that though this, in one single writer might be the effect of oversight, it is morally impossible that in so many, it should be accounted for otherwise than by supposing that their sense of the word αἱρετικος did not coincide with ours; and that it was therefore no blunder in them, that they did not employ their words according to an usage which came to be established long after their time. I am indeed surprised, that a man of Mosheim's critical sagacity, as well as profound knowledge of Christian antiquity, did not perceive that this was the only reasonable solution of the matter. But what might sometimes be thought the most obvious truth, is not always the first taken notice of. Now, I cannot help considering the easy manner in which this account removes the difficulty, as no small evidence of the explanation of the word in scriptural use, which has been given above. To observe the gradual alterations which arise in the meaning of words, as it is a point of some nicety, is also of great consequence in criticism; and often proves a powerful means both of fixing the date of genuine writings, and of detecting the supposititious.

§ 14. I SHALL observe, in passing, that the want of due attention to this circumstance in another instance, has greatly contributed to several errors in relation to Christian antiquities, and, particularly, to the multiplication of the primitive martyrs, far beyond the limits of probability. The Greek word μαρτυρ though signifying no more, originally, than *witness*, in which sense it is always used in the New Testament, came, by degrees, in ecclesiastical use, to be considerably restrained in its signification ὁι μαρτυρες τυ Ιμσυ, *the witnesses*

* Ουδαμως τον Ιησυν ὁμολογεσι υιον Θευ Σιμωνιανοι, αλλα δυναμιν Θευ λεγεσι τον Σιμωνα Orig. adv. Celf. lib. V.

† Orig. adv. Celf. lib. VI. ‡ Apol. 2da. Dialog. cum Tryphone. § Adv. Hæreſes, lib. I. cap. xx. xxi.

‖ Οφιανοι καλεμενοι τοσυτον αποδεεσι τυ ειναι Χριστιανοι, ωσε και ελαττον Κελσυ κατηγορειν αυτες τυ Ιησυ. Και μη προτερον προσιεσθαι τινα ἑτι το συνεδριον ἑαυτων, εαν μη αραςθηται κατα τυ Ιησυ. Adver. Celf. lib. VI.

¶ "Quotquot tribus prioribus fæculis SIMONIS Magi meminerunt, etsi hæreticorum eum familiam ducere jubent, per ea "tamen quæ de eo referunt, hæreticorum ordine excludunt, et inter Christianæ religionis hostes collocant. ORIGENES Simo- "nianos disertissime ex Christianis sectis exturbat, eosque non Iesum Christium, sed Simonem colere narrat. Cum hoc cæteri "omnes, alii claris verbis, alii sententiis, quas SIMONI tribuunt, consentiunt: quæ quidem sententiæ ejus sunt generis, ut nul- "li conveniant quam homini CHRISTO longissimi se præferenti, et divini legati dignitatem sibimet ipsi arroganti. Hinc *Simoni-* "*ani* etiam, quod ORIGENES et JUSTINUS MARTYR præter alios testantur, quum Christiani quotidianis pericules expositi "essent, nullis molestiis et injuriis afficiebantur: CHRISTUM enim eos detestari, publice notum erat. Sic ego primus, nisi fallor "quum ante viginti annos de Simone sentirem, erant, quibus periculosum et nefas videbatur, tot sanctorum virorum, qui SIMO- "NEM hæreticorum omnium patrem fecerunt, fidem in disceptationem vocare, tot sæculorum auctoritatem contemnere. Verum "sensim plures hæc sententia patronos, per ipsam evidentiam suam sibi acquisivit. Et non ita pridem tantum potuit apud JOS. "AUGUSTINUM ORSI, quem summo cum applausu ipsius Pontificis Maximi Romæ *Historiam Ecclesiasticam* Italico sermone "scribere notum est, ut eam approbaret." *Mosheimius De Rebus Christianis ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii.* Seculum "primum, § lxv. No. 3. The words in the text, to which the preceding note refers, are, "Toti hæreticorum agmini, "maxime cohorti gnosticæ, omnes veteris ecclesiæ doctores præponunt SIMONEM MAGUM.—Omnia quæ de SIMONE me- "moriæ ipsi prodiderunt, manifestum faciunt, eum non in corruptorum, religiones Christianæ, id est, hæreticorum, sed insen- "sissimorum ejus hostium numero ponendum esse qui et ipsum CHRISTU, maledictis insectabatur, et progredienti rei Christianæ "quæ poterat, impedimenta objiciebat."

neſſes of Jeſus, was, at firſt, in the church, applied, by way of eminence, only to the Apoſtles. The reality of this application, as well as the grounds of it, we learn from the Acts*. Afterward, it was extended to include all thoſe who, for their public teſtimony to the truth of Chriſtianity, eſpecially when emitted before magiſtrates and judges, were ſufferers in the cauſe, whether by death or by baniſhment, or in any other way. Laſtly, the name *martyr* (for then the word was adopted into other languages) became appropriated to thoſe who ſuffered death in conſequence of their teſtimony: the term ὁμολογητης, *confeſſor*, being, for diſtinction's ſake, aſſigned to thoſe witneſſes who, though they ſuffered in their perſons, liberty or goods, did not loſe their lives in the cauſe. Now, ſeveral later writers, in interpreting the ancients, have been miſled by the uſage of their own time; and have underſtood them as ſpeaking of thoſe who died for the name of Jeſus, when they ſpoke only of thoſe who openly atteſted his miracles and miſſion, agreably to the primitive and ſimple meaning of the word μαρτυρ. Of this Moſheim has juſtly taken notice in the work above quoted. I have here only obſerved it, by the way, for the ſake of illuſtration; for, as to the ſenſe wherein the word is uſed in the New Teſtament, no doubt ſeems ever to have ariſen†.

§ 15. I SHALL conclude, with adding to the obſervations on the words *ſchiſm* and *hereſy*, that how much ſoever of a ſchiſmatical or heritical ſpirit, in the apoſtolic ſenſe of the terms, may have contributed to the formation of the different ſects into which the Chriſtian world is at preſent divided; no perſon who, in the ſpirit of candour and charity, adheres to that which, to the beſt of his judgment, is right, though in this opinion he ſhould be miſtaken, is, in the ſcriptural ſenſe, either ſchiſmatic or heretic, and that he, on the contrary, whatever ſect he belong to, is more entitled to theſe odious appellations, who is moſt apt to throw the imputation upon others. Both terms, for they denote only different degrees of the ſame bad quality, always indicate a diſpoſition and practice unfriendly to peace, and harmony, and love.

* Acts i. 8. 22. ii. 32. iii. 15. v. 32. x. 39. xxii. 15. xxvi. 16. The laſt two paſſages quoted relate to Paul, who by being deſigned of God *a witneſs of the Lord Jeſus to all men*, was underſtood to be received into the apoſtleſhip, and into the ſociety of he twelve.

† "Ipſa vocabuli *martyr* ambiguitas apud homines imperitos voluntatem gignere potuit fabulas de tragico eorum [apoſtolo-" rum] exitu cogitandi. *Martyr* Græcorum ſermone quemlibet *teſtem* ſignificat. Sacro vero Chriſtianorum ſermone idem no-" men eminentiore ſenſu *teſtem* CHRISTI ſive hominem deſignat, qui moriendo teſtari voluit, ſpem omnem ſuam in CHRISTO " poſitam eſſe. Priori ſenſu apoſtoli ab ipſo CHRISTO μαρτυρες nominantur, et ipſi eodem vocabulo muneris ſui naturam ex-" plicant. Fieri vero facile potuit, ut indocti homines ad hæc ſacri codicis dicta poſteriorem vocabuli *Martyr* ſignificationem " transferrent, et temere ſibi propterea perſuaderent, Apoſtolos inter eos poni debere, quos excellentiori ſenſu Chriſtiani *Mar-" tyres* appellare ſolebant." Sæc. prim. § xvi. No. Our hiſtorian is here, from the ambiguity of the word, accounting only for the alledged martyrdom of all the Apoſtles except John. But every body who reflects will be ſenſible, that the ſame miſtake muſt have contributed to the increaſe of the number in other inſtances. For even in apoſtolical times, others than the Apoſtles, though more rarely, were called *witneſſes*. Stephen and Antipas are ſo denominated in ſacred writ. And as both theſe were put to death for their teſtimony, this has probably given riſe in after-times to the appropriation of the name *witneſs* or *martyr*, to thoſe who ſuffered death in the cauſe.

SECT.

DISSERTATION THE TENTH.

The chief Things to be attended to in tranſlating.—A comparative View of the oppoſite Methods taken by Tranſlators of Holy Writ.

PART I.

The Things to be attended to in tranſlating.

TO tranſlate has been thought, by ſome, a very eaſy matter to one who underſtands tolerably the language from which, and has made ſome proficiency in the language into which, the tranſlation is to be made. To tranſlate well is, however, in my opinion, a taſk of more difficulty than is commonly imagined. That we may be the better able to judge in this queſtion, let us conſider what a tranſlator, who would do juſtice to his author, and his ſubject, has to perform. The firſt thing, without doubt, which claims his attention, is to give a juſt repreſentation of the ſenſe of the original. This, it muſt be acknowledged, is the moſt eſſential of all. The ſecond thing is, to convey into his verſion, as much as poſſible, in a conſiſtency with the genius of the language which he writes, the author's ſpirit and manner, and, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, the very character of his ſtyle. The third and laſt thing is, to take care, that the verſion have, at leaſt, ſo far the quality of an original performance, as to appear natural and eaſy, ſuch as ſhall give no handle to the critic to charge the tranſlator with applying words improperly, or in a meaning not warranted by uſe, or combining them in a way which renders the ſenſe obſcure, and the conſtruction ungrammatical, or even harſh.

§ 2. Now, to adjuſt matters ſo as, in a conſiderable degree, to attain all theſe objects, will be found, upon inquiry, not a little arduous, even to men who are well acquainted with the two languages, and have great command of words. In purſuit of one of the ends abovementioned, we are often in danger of loſing ſight totally of another: nay, on ſome occaſions, it will appear impoſſible to attain one, without ſacrificing both the others. It may happen, that I cannot do juſtice to the ſenſe, without frequent recourſe to circumlocutions; for the words of no language whatever will, at all times, exactly correſpond with thoſe of another. Yet, by this method, a writer whoſe method is conciſe, ſimple, and energetic, is exhibited, in the tranſlation, as employing a ſtyle which is at once diffuſe, complex and languid. Again, in endeavouring to exhibit the author's manner, and to confine myſelf, as nearly as poſſible, to the ſame number of words, and the like turn of expreſſion, I may very imperfectly render his ſenſe, relating obſcurely, ambiguouſly, and even improperly, what is expreſſed with great propriety and perſpicuity in the original. And, in regard to the third object mentioned, it is evident, that when the two languages differ very much in their genius and ſtructure, it muſt be exceedingly difficult for a tranſlator to render this end perfectly compatible with the other two. It will perhaps be ſaid, that this is of leſs importance, as it ſeems ſolely to regard the quality of the work, as a performance in the tranſlator's language, whereas the other two regards the work only as an exhibition of the original. I admit that this is an object inferior to the other two; I meant it ſhould be underſtood ſo, by mentioning it laſt. Yet even this is by no means ſo unimportant as ſome would imagine. That a writing be perſpicuous in any language, much depends on the obſervance of propriety; and the beauty of the work (at leaſt as far as purity is concerned) contributes not a little to its utility. What is well written, or well ſaid, is always more attended to, better underſtood,

derſtood, and longer remembered, than what is improperly, weakly, or aukwardly, expreſſed.

§ 3. Now, if tranſlation is in general attended with ſo much difficulty, what muſt we think of the chance of ſucceſs which a tranſlator has, when the ſubject is of ſo great importance, that an uncommon degree of attention to all the abovementioned objects, will be exacted of him; and when the difference, in point of idiom, of the language from which, and of that into which the verſion is made, is as great, perhaps, as we have any example of. For, in tranſlating the New Teſtament into Engliſh, it is not to the Greek idiom, nor to the Oriental, that we are required to adapt our own, but to a certain combination of both; often, rather, to the Hebrew and Chaldaic idioms, involved in Greek words and ſyntax. The analogy and prevailing uſage in Greek, will, if we be not on our guard, ſometimes miſlead us. On the contrary, theſe are ſometimes ſafe and proper guides. But, without a conſiderable acquaintance with both, it will be impoſſible to determine, when we ought to be directed by the one, and when by the other.

§ 4. THERE are two extremes in tranſlating, which are commonly taken notice of by thoſe who examine this ſubject critically; from one extreme, we derive what is called a cloſe and literal, from the other, a looſe and free tranſlation. Each has its advocates. But though the latter kind is moſt patroniſed, when the ſubject is a performance merely human, the general ſentiments, as far as I am able to collect them, ſeem rather to favour the former, when the ſubject is any part of holy writ. And this difference appears to proceed from a very laudable principle, that we are not entitled to uſe ſo much freedom with the dictates of inſpiration, as with the works of a fellow-creature. It often happens, however, on ſuch general topics, when no particular verſion is referred to as an example of exceſs on one ſide, or on the other, that people agree in words, when their opinions differ, and differ in words, when their opinions agree. For, I may conſider a tranſlation as cloſe, which another would denominate free, or as free, which another would denominate cloſe. Indeed, I imagine that, in the beſt ſenſe of the words, a good tranſlation ought to have both theſe qualities. To avoid all ambiguity, therefore, we ſhall call one extreme *literal*, as manifeſting a greater attention to the letter than to the meaning; the other *looſe*, as implying under it, not liberty, but licentiouſneſs. In regard even to literal tranſlations, there may be ſo many differences in degree, that, without ſpecifying, it is in vain to argue, or to hope to lay down any principles that will prove entirely ſatisfactory.

PART II.

Strictures on Arias Montanus.

AMONG the Latin tranſlations of Scripture, therefore, for I ſhall confine myſelf to theſe in this Diſſertation, let us ſelect *Arias Montanus* for an example of the literal. His verſion of both Teſtaments is very generally known, and commonly printed along with the original, not in ſeparate columns, but, for the greater benefit of the learner, interlined. This work of Arias, of all that I know, goes the fartheſt in this way, being preciſely on the model of the Jewiſh tranſlations, not ſo much of the Septuagint, though the Septuagint certainly exceeds in this reſpect, as on the model of Aquila, which, from the fragments that ſtill remain of that verſion, appears to have been ſervilely literal. Arias, therefore, is a fit example of what may be expected in this mode of tranſlating.

§ 2. Now, that we may proceed more methodically in our examination, let us inquire how far every one of the three ends in tranſlating abovementioned, is anſwered by a verſion conſtructed on the ſame plan. The firſt and principal end is to give a juſt repreſentation of the ſenſe of the original. But how, it may be aſked, can a tranſlator fail of attaining this end, who never wanders from the path marked out to him; who does not, like others, turn aſide for a moment to pluck flowers by the way, wherewith to garniſh his performance; who is, on the contrary, always found in his author's track; in ſhort, who has it as his ſole object, to give you, in the words of another language, exactly what his author ſays, and in the order and manner wherein he ſays it, and, I had almoſt added

(for

(for this, too, is his aim, though not always attainable), not one word more or less than he says? However he might fail in respect of the other ends mentioned, one would be apt to think he must certainly succeed in conveying the sentiments of his author. Yet, upon trial, we find that, in no point whatever, does the literal translator fail more remarkably, than in this, of exhibiting the sense. Nor will this be found so unaccountable, upon reflection, as, on a superficial view, it may appear. Were the words of the one language exactly correspondent to those of the other, in meaning and extent; were the modes of combining the words in both entirely similar, and the grammatical or customary arrangement the same, and were the idioms and phrases resulting thence perfectly equivalent, such a conclusion might reasonably be deduced: but, when all the material circumstances are nearly the reverse, as is certainly the case of Hebrew, compared with Latin; when the greater part of the words of one, are far from corresponding accurately, either in meaning or in extent, to those of the other; when the construction is dissimilar, and the idioms, resulting from the like combinations of corresponding words, by no means equivalent, there is the greatest probability, that an interpreter, of this stamp, will often exhibit to his readers what has no meaning at all, and sometimes a meaning very different from, or perhaps opposite to, that of his author.

§ 3. I SHALL briefly illustrate, from the aforesaid translation, what I have advanced, and that, first, in words, next, in phases or idioms. I had occasion, in a former dissertation*, to take notice of a pretty numerous class of words which, in no two languages whatever, are found perfectly to correspond, though, in those tongues wherein there is a greater affinity, they come nearer to suit each other, than in those tongues wherein the affinity is less. In regard to such, I observed, that the translator's only possible method of rendering them justly, is by attending to the scope of the author, as discovered by the context, and choosing such a term in the language which he writes, as suits best the original term, in the particular situation in which he finds it.

§ 4. BUT this is far from being the method of the literal translator. The defenders of this manner would, if possible, have nothing subjected to the judgment of the interpreter, but have every thing determined by general and mechanical rules. Hence, they insist, above all things, on preserving uniformity, and rendering the same word in the original, wherever it occurs, or however it is connected, by the same word in the version. And as the much greater part of the words, not of one tongue only, but of every tongue, are equivocal, and have more significations than one, they have adopted these two rules for determining their choice, among the different meanings of which the term is susceptible. The first is, to adopt the meaning, wherever it is discoverable, to which etymology points, though in defiance of the meaning suggested, both by the context and by general use. When this rule does not answer, as when the derivation is uncertain, the second is, to adopt that which of all the senses of the word appears to the translator the most common, and adhere to it inflexibly, in every case, whatever absurdity or nonsense it may involve him in. Perhaps, not even the most literal interpreters observe inviolably these rules. But one thing is certain, that in those cases wherein they assume the privilege of dispensing with them, this measure is, in no respect, more necessary than in many of the cases wherein they rigidly observe them. I may add another thing, as equally certain, that whenever they think proper to supersede those rules, they betray a consciousness of the insufficiency of the fundamental principles of their method, as well as of the necessity there is, that the translator use his best discernment and skill for directing him, first, in the discovery of the meaning of his author, and, secondly, in the proper choice of words for expressing it in his version.

§ 5. I SHALL exemplify the observance of the two rules abovementioned, in the version I proposed to consider. And, first, for that of etymology; the passage in Genesis†, which is properly rendered in the common translation, *Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature*: Arias renders, *reptificent aquæ reptile*. It is true, that the word which he barbarously translates *reptificent* (for there is no such Latin word), is in the Hebrew conjugation called *hiphil*, of a verb which in *kal*, that is in the simple and radical form, signifies *repere, to creep*. Analogically, therefore, the verb in *hiphil* should import, *to cause to creep*. It had been accordingly rendered by Pagninus, a critic of the same stamp, but not such an adept as Arias, *repere faciant*. But in Hebrew, as in all other languages, use, both in altering and in adding, exercises an uncontroulable dominion over all the parts of speech. We have just the same evidence that the original verb in *hiphil*, commonly signifies to produce in abundance, like fishes and reptiles, as we have that in *kal*, it signifies *to creep*. Now, passing the barbarism *reptificent*, the sense which this version conveys, if it convey any sense, is totally different from the manifest sense of the author. It is the creation, or first production of things, which Moses is relating. Arias, in this instance, (as well as Pagnin), seems to exhibit things

* Diss. II. § 4.

† Gen. i. 20.

things as already produced, and to relate only how they were ſet in motion. What other meaning can we give to words importing: "Let the waters cauſe the creeping thing to creep?" or, if, by a ſimilar barbariſm in Engliſh, we may be allowed to give a more exact repreſentation of the more barbarous Latin of Arias: "Let the waters creepify the creeper?"

Another example of etymological verſion, in defiance of uſe and of common ſenſe, we have, in the beginning of the ſong of Moſes *. The words rendered in the Engliſh tranſlation, *My doctrine ſhall drop as the rain*, Arias tranſlates, "Stillabit ut pluvia aſſumptio mea." The word here rendered *aſſumptio* has, for its etymon, a verb which commonly ſignifies *ſumo*, *capio*. That ſage interpreter, it ſeems, thought it of more importance to acquaint his reader with this circumſtance, than with the obvious meaning of the word itſelf. And thus, a paſſage, which, in the original, is neither ambiguous nor obſcure, is rendered in ſuch a manner as would defy Oedipus to unriddle.

§ 6. As to the ſecond rule mentioned, of adopting that which of all the ſignifications of the word, appears to the tranſlator the moſt common, and to adhere to it inflexibly in every caſe, however unſuitable it may be to the context, and however much it may mar the ſenſe of the diſcourſe, there is hardly a page, nay, a paragraph, nay, a line in Arias, which does not furniſh us with an example. Nor does it take place in one only, but in all the parts of ſpeech. Firſt, in nouns†, *Et hoc verbum quo circumcidit*. The Hebrew word rendered *verbum*, anſwers both to *verbum*, and to *res*; but as the more common meaning is *verbum*, it muſt, by this rule, be made always ſo, in ſpite of the connection. In this manner he corrects Pagnin, who had rendered the expreſſion, juſtly and intelligibly, *Hæc eſt cauſa quare circumcidit*. In that expreſſion†, *Filius fructeſcens Joſeph ſuper fontem*, we have both his rules exemplified, the firſt in the barbarous participle *fructeſcens*, which has a derivation ſimilar to the Hebrew word; the ſecond in the ſubſtantive *filius*, which is no doubt the moſt common ſignification of the Hebrew בן *ben*, and in the preposition *ſuper*. In this manner he corrects Pagnin, who had ſaid, not badly, *Ramus creſcens Joſeph juxta fontem*.

§ 7. And, to ſhew that he made as little account of the reproach of ſoleciſm as of that of barbariſm, he ſays, as abſurdly as unmeaningly, *Pater fuit ſedentis tentorium* §, giving a regimen to a neuter verb. Pagnin had ſaid, *inhabitantis*. That this is conformable to the ſignification of the Hebrew word in this paſſage, which the other is not, there can be no queſtion; but it might fairly bear a queſtion, whether *ſedeo* or *inhabito* be the more common meaning of the Hebrew word. The ſame ſtrange rule he follows in the indeclinable parts of ſpeech, the prepoſitions in particular, which being few in Hebrew, and conſequently of more extenſive ſignification, he has choſen always to render the ſame way, thereby darkening the cleareſt paſſages, and expreſſing, in the moſt abſurd manner, the moſt elegant.

As I would avoid being tedious, I ſhall produce but two other examples of this, having given one already from Jacob's benediction to his ſons, though the whole work abounds with examples. The expreſſion uſed by Pagnin, in the account of the creation, *Dividat aquas ab aquis* ‖, he has thus reformed, *Sit dividens inter aquas ad aquas*. The other is in the account of the murder of Abel ¶, *Surrexit Cain ad Hebel*, where Pagnin had uſed the prepoſition *contra*. As a ſpecimen of the ſervile manner in which he traces the arrangement and conſtruction of the original, to the total ſubverſion of all rule and order in the language which he writes, I ſhall give the following paſſage in the New Teſtament, not ſelected as peculiar, for ſuch are to be found in every page: *De quidem enim miniſterio in ſanctos, ex abundanti mihi eſt ſcribere vobis*.

§ 8. To proceed now, as I propoſed, to phraſes or combinations of words: I ſhall, firſt, produce ſome examples which convey a mere jargon of words, combined ungrammatically, and, therefore, to thoſe who do not underſtand the language out of which the tranſlation is made, unintelligibly. Such are the following: *Iſtæ generationes cœli et terræ, in creari ea, in die facere Deus terram et cœlum.***---*Emiſit eum Dominus ad colendam terram quod ſumptus eſt inde*††.---*Major iniquitas mea quam parcere* ‡‡." But as, in certain caſes, this manner of copying a foreign idiom, makes downright nonſenſe, in other caſes, the like combinations of correſponding words, in different languages, though not unmeaning, do not convey the ſame meaning, nay, ſometimes convey meanings the very reverſe of one another. Thus, two negatives in Greek and French deny ſtrongly, in Latin and Engliſh they affirm לא כל *col la*, in Hebrew is *none: non omnis*, in Latin, which is a literal verſion, and *not all*, in Engliſh, denote *ſome*. In like manner, οὐκ conſtrued with οὐδεὶς, in Greek, is ſtill *nobody; non nemo*, in Latin, which is a literal verſion, is *ſomebody*. The words

* Deut. xxxii. 2. † Joſhua v. 4. ‡ Gen. xlix. 22. § Gen. iv. 20. ‖ Gen. i. 6.
¶ 2 Cor. ix. 1. ** Gen. ii. 4. †† Gen. iii. 23. ‡‡ Gen. iv. 13.

και ου μελει σοι περι ουδενος *, rendered properly in the common version, *and careſt for no man*, are tranſlated by Arias, *Et non cura eſt tibi de nullo*; the very oppoſite of our ſentiment, which would have been more juſtly rendered, *Et cura eſt tibi de nullo*; or, as it is in the Vulgate, *Non curas quenquam*. In this, however, hardly any of the literal interpreters have judged proper to obſerve a ſtrict uniformity; though I will venture to ſay, it would be impoſſible to aſſign a good reaſon why, in ſome inſtances, they depart from that method, whilſt in others they tenaciouſly adhere to it.

§ 9. It ought, withal, to be obſerved, that ſeveral interpreters who, in tranſlating ſingle words, have not confined themſelves to the abſurd method abovementioned, could not be perſuaded to take the ſame liberty with idioms and phraſes. Thus Arias has but copied the Vulgate in tranſlating, οτι ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω θεω παν ρημα †, *Quia non erit impoſſibile apud Deum omne verbum*. In this ſhort ſentence there are no fewer than three improprieties, one ariſing from the miſ-tranſlation of a noun, and the other two from miſ-tranſlated idioms. ρημα in Helleniſtic uſage, is equivalent to the Hebrew דבר *daber*, which, as has been obſerved, ſignifies not only *verbum*, a word, but *res*, or *negotium*, a thing; which laſt is the manifeſt ſenſe of it in the paſſage quoted: the ſecond is the rendering of παν, *non omne*, and not, as it ought to have been, *nullum*: the third ariſes from uſing the future in Latin, in the enunciation of an univerſal truth. It ought to have been remembered, that the Hebrew has no preſent tenſe, and is conſequently obliged often to uſe the other tenſes, and eſpecially the future, in enunciating general truths, for which, in all modern languages, as well as in Greek and Latin, we employ the preſent. In conſequence of theſe blunders, the verſion, as it lies, is perfectly unmeaning; whereas, no perſon, that is even but a ſmatterer in Hebrew, will heſitate to declare, that the ſenſe is completely expreſſed in Engliſh, in theſe words: *For nothing is impoſſible with God.*

§ 10. There are few of the old verſions which have kept entirely clear of this fault. In the ancient Latin tranſlation called the Italic, whereof we have not now a complete copy remaining, there were many more barbariſms than in the preſent Vulgate. And even Jerom himſelf acquaints us that, when he ſet about making a new verſion, he left ſeveral things which he knew to be not properly expreſſed, for fear of giving offence to the weak, by his numerous and bold alterations. This idiom of *non omne*, for *nihil* or *nullum*, ſeems to have been one which, in many places, though not in all, he has corrected. Thus, what in the old Italic, after the Septuagint, was *Non eſt omne recens ſub ſole* ‡, he has rendered perſpicuouſly and properly, *Nihil ſub ſole novum*. A ſlaviſh attachment to the letter, in tranſlating without any regard to the meaning, is originally the offſpring of the ſuperſtition, not of the church, but of the ſynagogue, where it would have been more ſuitable in Chriſtian interpreters, the miniſters, not of the letter, but of the ſpirit, to have allowed it to remain.

§ 11. That this is not the way to anſwer the firſt and principal end of tranſlating, has, I think, been ſufficiently demonſtrated. Inſtead of the ſenſe of the original, it ſometimes gives us downright nonſenſe; frequently a meaning quite different, and not ſeldom it makes the author ſay in another language, the reverſe of what he ſaid in his own. Can it then be doubted, that this is not the way to attain the ſecond end in tranſlating? Is this a method whereby a tranſlator can convey into his verſion, as much as poſſible, in a conſiſtency with the genius of a different language, the author's ſpirit and manner, and (ſo to ſpeak) the very character of his ſtyle? It is evident, that the firſt end may be attained, where this is not attained. An author's meaning may be given, but in a different manner; a conciſe writer may be made to expreſs himſelf diffuſely, or a diffuſe writer conciſely; the ſenſe of an elegant work may be juſtly given, though in a homely dreſs. But it does not hold converſely, that the ſecond end may be attained without the firſt; for when an author's ſenſe is not given, he is not fairly repreſented. Can we do juſtice to his manner, if, when he reaſons conſequentially, he be exhibited as talking incoherently; if what he writes perſpicuouſly, be rendered ambiguouſly or obſcurely; if what flows from his pen naturally and eaſily, in the true idiom and conſtruction of his language, be rendered ruggedly and unnaturally, by the violence perpetually done to the conſtruction of the language, into which it is tranſmuted, rather than tranſlated? The manner of a tall man, who walks with dignity, would be wretchedly repreſented by a dwarf who had no other mode of imitation, but to number and trace his footſteps. The immoderate ſtrides and diſtortions which this ridiculous attempt would oblige the imitator to employ, could never convey to the ſpectators an idea of eaſy and graceful motion.

§ 12. The third end of tranſlating, that of preſerving purity and perſpicuity in the language into which the verſion is made, is not ſo much as aimed at, by any of the literal tribe. Upon the whole, I cannot expreſs

* Mark xii. 14. † Luke i. 37. ‡ Eccl. i. 9.

expreſs my ſentiments more juſtly both of Arias and of Pagnin, than in the words of Houbigant, who *, in aſſigning his reaſons for not adopting the verſion of either, ſays, "Non facerem meam illam verſionem "Ariæ Montani horridam, inficetam, obſcuram, talem "denique qualem compoſuiſſet, ſi quis homines de- "terrere ab ſacris codicibus legendis voluiſſet. Non "illam Pagnini, quam Arias, jam malam, fecit imi- "tando ac interpolando pejorem." In this laſt remark, which may in part be juſtified by ſome of the foregoing examples, he perfectly agrees with Father Simon, who ſays of Arias's amendments on Pagnin's tranſlation, *Quot correctiones, tot corruptiones.* For there is hardly any thing altered that is not for the worſe. Such Latin verſions would be quite unintelligible, if it were not for the knowledge we have of the original, and of the common Engliſh verſion, which is as literal as any verſion ought to be, and ſometimes more ſo. The coincidence of two or three words recalls the whole paſſage to our memory; but we may venture to pronounce that, to an ancient Roman, who knew nothing of the learning or opinions of the Eaſt, the whole of Arias's Bible would appear no better than a jumble of words without meaning.

§ 13. To all the other evil conſequences reſulting from ſuch verſions, we ought to add that they neceſſarily lead the unlearned reader into an opinion that the original, which is ſuſceptible of them, muſt be totally indefinite, equivocal, and obſcure. Few, without making the experiment, can allow themſelves to think that it is equally poſſible by this mode of tranſlation, completely to diſfigure and render unintelligible what is written with plainneſs and ſimplicity, and without any ambiguity, in their mother-tongue. Yet nothing is more certain than that the moſt perſpicuous writing, in any language, may be totally diſguiſed by this treatment †. Were the ancient Greek or Latin claſſics, in proſe or verſe, to be thus rendered into any modern tongue, nobody could bear to read them. Strange indeed, that a treatment ſhould ever have been accounted reſpectful to the ſacred penmen, which, if given to any other writer, would be univerſally condemned, as no better than dreſſing him in a fool's coat.

* Proleg. p. 178.

† As it is impoſſible, without an example, to conceive how monſtrous the transformation is, which it occaſions, I ſhall here ſubjoin a ſpecimen of a few Engliſh ſentences tranſlated into Latin, in the taſte and manner of Arias. "Ego inveni aliquod "Pecus in meo frumento, et poſui illa in meam libram. Ego rogavi unum qui ſtabat per, ſi ille novit cujus illa erant. Sed "ille vertit unam viam a me, et fecit non ita multum ut vindicare ſalvum ad redire mihi ullam reſponſionem. Super hoc ego "rogavi unum alium qui dixit unam magnam tabulam abiegnam in replicatione quam ego feci non ſubſtare. Quam unquam "ego volui non habere poſita illa ſurſum, habui ego notu ad quem illa pertinebant; nam ego didici poſt cuſtodias quod ille fuit "unus ego fui multum aſpectus ad." Were theſe few lines put into the hands of a learned foreigner, who does not underſtand Engliſh, he might ſooner learn to read Chineſe, than to divine their meaning. Yet a little attention would bring an Engliſhman who knows Latin, ſoon to diſcover that they were intended as a verſion, if we may call it ſo, of the following words, which in the manner of Arias, I give with the verſion interlined.

Ego inveni aliquod pecus in meo frumento, et poſui illa in meam libram. Ego rogavi unum qui ſtabat per ſi ille novit cujus
I found ſome cattle in my corn, and put them into my pound. I aſked one who ſtood by if he knew whoſe
illa erant. Sed ille vertit unam viam a me, et fecit non ita multum ut vindicare ſalvum ad redire mihi ullam reſponſionem.
they were. But he turned a way from me, and did not ſo much as vouch ſafe to return me any anſwer.
Super hoc ego rogavi unum alium qui dixit unam magnam tabulam abiegnam in replicatione quam ego feci non ſubſtare.
Upon this I aſked another who ſaid a great deal in reply which I did not underſtand.
Quam unquam ego volui non habere poſita illa ſurſum, habui ego notum ad quem illa pertinebant, nam ego dedici poſt cuſtodias
However I would not have put them up, had I known to whom they belonged, for I learned afterwards
quod ille fuit unus ego fui multum aſpectus ad.
that he was one I was much beholden to.

Should one object that the Latin words here employed do not ſuit the ſenſe of the correſponding words in the paſſage tranſlated, it is admitted that they do not; but they are ſelected in exact conformity to the fundamental rules followed by Arias. Thus *una via* away, *vindicare ſalvum* vouchſafe, *quam unquam* however, *tabula abiegna* deal, *ſubſtare* underſtand, *poſt cuſtodias* afterwards, *aſpectus* beholden, are all agreeable to the primary rules of etymology, and, in no reſpect, worſe than *reptifico*, where both ſenſe and uſe required *produco*; or *aſſumptio* for *doctrina*, to the utter deſtruction of all meaning, or *non omnis* for *nullus*, which gives a meaning quite different. But by what rule, it may be aſked, is *pound* rendered *libra*, in a caſe wherein it manifeſtly means *ſeptum*? By the ſame rule, it is anſwered, whereby *iaſhab* is rendered *ſedere*, in a caſe wherein both the ſenſe and the conſtruction required *inhabitare*, and *daber* is rendered *verbum* where it manifeſtly means *res*, the golden rule of uniformity, by which every term ought always to be rendered the ſame way, and agreeably to its moſt common ſignification, without minding whether it made ſenſe or nonſenſe ſo rendered. [The literal tranſlator follows implicitly the ſage direction given by Cajetan. "Non ſit vobis curæ, ſi ſenſus non apparet, quia non eſt veſtri officii exponere, ſed interpretari: interpretamini ſicut jacet, et re- "linquatis expoſitoribus curam intelligendi." Præf. Comment. in Pſalm.] Now it is certain that *pound* occurs oftener in the ſenſe of *libra* than in that of *ſeptum*. But how do you admit ſuch groſs ſoleciſms as *redire reſponſionem*? I anſwer, Is this more ſo than *ſedere tentorium*? or do the prepoſitions as uſed here in *ſlabat per* and *aſpectus ad*, make the conſtruction more monſtrous, than *inter ad* in that ſentence *ſit dividens inter aquas ad aquas*? Beſides, there is not a word in the above ſpecimen, which, taken ſeverally, is not Latin: ſo much cannot be ſaid for Arias, whoſe work is over-run with barbariſms as well as ſoleciſms. Witneſs his *fructuſcens* and *reptificent*, in the few examples above produced. And in regard to the total incoherence and want of conſtruction, can any thing in this way exceed *in creari ea*, or *in die facere Deus*, or *ad terram quod ſumptus eſt inde*, or *major iniquitas quam parcere*?

I am not at all ſurpriſed that certain great men of the church of Rome, like Cardinal Cajetan, who (though, with foreign aſſiſtance, he tranſlated the Pſalms) did not underſtand a word of Hebrew, ſhow themſelves great admirers of this method. The more unintelligible the Scriptures are made, the greater is the need of an infallible interpreter, an article of which they never loſe ſight. But that others, who have not the ſame motive, and poſſeſs a degree of underſtanding ſuperior to that of a Jewiſh cabaliſt, ſhould recommend an expedient, which ſerves only for debaſing and diſcrediting the dictates of the divine ſpirit, appears perfectly unaccountable. I ſhall only add, that verſions of this kind are very improperly called tranſlations. The French have a convenient word, *traveſty*, by which they denote the metamorphoſis of a ſerious work into mere burleſque by dreſſing it in ſuch language as renders it ridiculous, makes the nobleſt thoughts appear contemptible, the richeſt images beggarly, and the moſt judicious obſervations abſurd. I would not ſay, therefore, the Bible *tranſlated*, but the Bible *traveſtied*, by Arias Montanus. For that can never deſerve the name of a tranſlation, which gives you neither the matter nor the manner of the author, but, on the contrary, often exhibits both as the reverſe of what they are. Malvenda, a Dominican, is another interpreter of the ſame tribe with his brother Pagnin, and with Arias, whom he is ſaid greatly to have exceeded in darkneſs, barbariſm, and nonſenſe. I never ſaw his verſion, but have reaſon to believe, from the accounts given of it by good judges, that it can anſwer no valuable purpoſe.

PART III.

Strictures on the Vulgate.

I PROCEED now to conſider a little the merit of ſome other Latin tranſlations of holy writ. The firſt, doubtleſs, that deſerves our attention, in reſpect both of antiquity, and I may ſay, of univerſality in the Weſtern churches, is the *Vulgate*. The verſion which is known by this name, at leaſt the greater part of it, is juſtly aſcribed to Jerom, and muſt therefore be dated from the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century. As its reception in the church was gradual, voluntary, and not in conſequence of the command of a ſuperior, and as, for ſome ages, the old Latin verſion, called the *Italic*, continued, partly from the influence of cuſtom, partly from reſpect to antiquity, to be regarded and uſed by many, there is reaſon to believe that a part of that verſion ſtill remains in the Vulgate, and is, in a manner blended with it. One thing at leaſt is certain, that in ſeveral places of the Vulgate we find thoſe expreſſions and ways of rendering which that learned father in his works ſtrongly condemned, at the ſame time that, in other parts, we ſee his emendations regularly followed. Beſides, as I hinted before, there were ſeveral corrections, which, though his judgment approved them, he did not think it prudent to adopt, for fear of ſhocking the ſentiments of the people. From this it may naturally be inferred, that the manner and ſtyle of the Vulgate will not be found equal and uniform. And I believe no perſon who has examined it with a critical eye, will deny that this is the caſe.

§ 2. FROM what remains of the old Italic, it appears to have been much in the taſte of almoſt all the Jewiſh tranſlations, extremely literal, and conſequently, in a great degree, obſcure, ambiguous, and barbarous. To give a Latin tranſlation of the Scriptures, which might at once be more perſpicuous, and more juſt to the original, was the great and laudable deſign of that eminent light of the Weſtern churches abovementioned. The Old Teſtament part of the Italic verſion had been made entirely from the Septuagint (for the Hebrew Scriptures were for ſome ages of no eſtimation in the church); but Jerom, being well ſkilled in Hebrew, undertook to tranſlate from the original. This itſelf has made, in ſome paſſages, a conſiderable difference on the ſenſe. And, as the verſion of the Seventy has generally the mark of a ſervile attachment to the letter, there can be no doubt that there muſt have been conſiderable differences of reading, in the Hebrew manuſcripts extant at the times when the ſeveral parts of that verſion were made, from thoſe in common uſe at preſent. And though I think, upon the whole, that the Hebrew Scriptures are much preferable, an acquaintance with the Septuagint is of great importance for ſeveral reaſons, and particularly for this, that it often

often aſſiſts in ſuggeſting the true reading in caſes where the preſent Hebrew copies are obſcure, or appear to have been vitiated. Jerom judiciouſly recurred to that tranſlation in ſuch caſes, and often borrowed light from it, when it was more perſpicuous than the Hebrew, and when the meaning which it contained ſeemed better adapted to the context. Perhaps he would have done ſtill better to have recurred oftener. For, however learned thoſe Jews were, to whoſe aſſiſtance he owed the acquiſition of the language, they were ſtrongly tinctured with the cabaliſtical prejudices which prevailed, more or leſs, in all the literati of that nation. Hence they were ſometimes led, on very fanciful grounds, to aſſign to words and phraſes, meanings not ſupported by the obvious ſenſe of the context, nor even by the moſt ancient verſions and paraphraſes. In this caſe, there can be no doubt that theſe were more to be confided in than his Jewiſh inſtructors.

§ 3. No intelligent perſon will queſtion the fitneſs of that judicious and learned writer, for the taſk of tranſlating the Bible into his native language. But that we may not be led too far in transferring to the work, the perſonal merit of the author, we ought to remember two things, firſt, that the Vulgate, as we have it at preſent, is not entirely the work of Jerom; and, ſecondly, that even in what Jerom tranſlated, he left many things, as he himſelf acknowleges, which needed correction, but which he did not chuſe to alter, leſt the liberties taken with the old tranſlation ſhould ſcandalize the vulgar. It is no wonder, then, that great inequalities ſhould be obſervable in the execution. In many places it is excellent. The ſenſe of the original is conveyed juſtly and perſpicuouſly; no affectation in the ſtyle; on the contrary, the greateſt ſimplicity combined with purity. But this cannot be ſaid with truth of every part of that work.

§ 4. In the preceding part of this Diſſertation *, I took notice of one paſſage rendered exactly in the manner of Arias, who found nothing to alter in it, in order to bring it down to his level. Indeed there are many ſuch inſtances. Thus ουκ αν εσωθη πασα σαρξ is rendered, *Non fieret ſalva omnis caro* †. In ſome places we find barbariſms and ſoleciſms, to which it would be difficult to diſcover a temptation, the juſt expreſſion being both as literal and as obvious as the improper one that has been preferred to it. Of this ſort, we may call, *Neque Nubent, neque nubentur* ‡. *Nonne vos magis plures eſtes illis* §? *Non capit prophetam perire extra Jeruſalem* ‖, and *Filius hominis non venit miniſtrari ſed miniſtrare* ¶. Yet, as to the laſt example, the ſame words in another Goſpel are rendered without the ſoleciſm, *Filius hominis non venit ut miniſtraretur ei, ſed ut miniſtraret* **. Very often we meet with inſtances of the ſame original word rendered by the ſame Latin word, when the ſenſe is manifeſtly different, and the idiom of the tongue does not admit it. This abſurdity extends even to conjunctions. The Greek οτι anſwers frequently to the Latin *quia*, *becauſe*, and not ſeldom, to *quod*, *that*. Here, however, it is almoſt uniformly rendered *quia* or *quoniam*, in defiance of grammar and common ſenſe. Thus, *Tunc, confitebor illis quia nunquam novi vos* ††, and *Magiſter ſcimus quia verax es*‡‡. Theſe expreſſions are no better Latin, than theſe which follow are Engliſh. *Then will I confeſs to them, becauſe I never knew you*, and, *Maſter we know becauſe thou art true*: words which, if they ſuggeſt any meaning, it is evidently not the meaning of the author; nor is it a meaning which the original would have ever ſuggeſted to one who underſtands the language.

Nay, ſometimes even the favourite rule of uniformity is violated, but not for the ſake of keeping to the ſenſe, the ſenſe being rather hurt by the violation. Thus λαος anſwering to *populus*, and commonly ſo rendered, is ſometimes improperly tranſlated *plebs*. Εποιησε λυτρωσιν τω λαω αυτυ §§, is rendered *Fecit redemptionem plebis ſuæ*. Sometimes the moſt unmeaning barbariſms are adopted merely to repreſent the etymology of the original term. Τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον δος ημιν σημερον, is rendered *Panem noſtrum ſuperſubſtantialem da nobis hodie* ‖‖. *Panis ſuperſubſtantialis* is juſt as barbarous Latin as *ſuperſubſtantial bread* would be in Engliſh, and equally unintelligible. There is an additional evil reſulting from this manner of treating holy writ, that the ſoleciſms, barbariſms, and nonſenſical expreſſions which it gives riſe to, prove a fund of materials to the viſionary, out of which his imagination frames a thouſand myſteries.

§ 5. I would not, however, be underſtood by theſe remarks, as paſſing a general cenſure on this verſion, which, though not to be followed implicitly, may, I am convinced, be of great ſervice to the critic. It ought to weigh with us, that even the lateſt part of this tranſlation was made about fourteen hundred years ago, and is conſequently many centuries prior to all the Latin tranſlations now current, none of which can claim an earlier date than the revival of letters in the Weſt. I do not uſe this argument from an immoderate regard to antiquity, or from the notion that age can give a ſanction to error. But there are two things in this circumſtance which ought to recommend the work in queſtion, to the attentive exa-

* § 9.
† Matth. xxiv. 22.
‡ Matt. xxii. 30. Mark xii. 25.
§ Matth. vi. 26.
‖ Luke xiii. 33.
¶ Matth. xx. 28.
** Mark x. 45.
†† Matt. vii. 23.
‡‡ Matt xxii. 16.
§§ Luke i. 68.
‖‖ Matth. vi. 11.

mination of the critic. First that, having been made from manuscripts older than most, perhaps than any, now extant, it serves, in some degree, to supply the place of those manuscripts, and furnish us with the probable means of discovering what the readings were, which Jerom found in the copies he so carefully collated. Another reason is, that being finished long before those controversies arose, which are the foundation of the sects now subsisting, we may rest assured that, in regard to these, there will be no bias from party zeal to either side of the question. We cannot say so much for the translations which have been made since the rise of Protestantism, either by Protestants or Papists. And these are, in my opinion, two not inconsiderable advantages.

§ 6. I TAKE notice of the last the rather, because many Protestants, on account of the declaration of its authenticity, solemnly pronounced by the council of Trent, cannot avoid considering it as a Popish Bible, calculated for supporting the Roman Catholic cause. Now this is an illiberal conclusion, the offspring of ignorance, which I it think of some consequence to refute. It is no further back than the sixteenth century, since that judgment was given in approbation of this version, the first authoritative declaration made in its favour. Yet the estimation in which it was universally held throughout the Western churches, was, to say the least, not inferior before that period to what it is at present. And, we may say with truth, that though no judicious Protestant will think more favourably of this translation, on account of their verdict; neither will he, on this account, think less favourably of it. It was not because this version was peculiarly adapted to the Romish system, that it received the sanction of that synod; but because it was the only Bible with which the far greater part of the members had from their infancy had the least acquaintance. There were but few in that assembly who understood either Greek or Hebrew. They had heard that the Protestants, the new heretics, as they called them, had frequent recourse to the original, and were beginning to make versions from it; a practice of which their own ignorance of the original made them the more jealous. Their fears being thus alarmed, they were exceedingly anxious to interpose their authority, by the declaration abovementioned, for preventing new translations being obtruded on the people. They knew what the Vulgate contained; and had been early accustomed to explain it in their own way. But they did not know what might be produced from new translations. Therefore, to preoccupy men's minds, and prevent every true son of the church from reading other, especially modern, translations, and from paying any regard to what might be urged from the original, the very indefinite sentence was pronounced in favour of the Vulgate, *vetus et vulgata editio*, that in all disputes it should be held for authentic, *ut pro authentica habeatur*.

§ 7. Now if, instead of this measure, that council had ordered a translation to be made by men nominated by them, in opposition to those published by Protestants, the case would have been very different: for we may justly say that, amidst such a ferment as was then excited, there should have appeared, in a version so prepared, any thing like impartiality, candour, or discernment, would have been morally impossible. Yet even such a production would have been entitled to a fair examination from an adversary, and to judge impartially of what he offers. As that, however was not the case, we ought not to consider the version in question as either the better or the worse for their verdict. It is but doing justice to say, that it is noway calculated to support Romish errors and corruptions. It had been in current use in the church, for ages before the much greater part of those errors and corruptions was introduced. No doubt the schoolmen had acquired the knack of explaining it in such a way as favoured their own prejudices. But is this any more than we find the most discordant sects acquire with regard to the original, or even to a translation which they use in common? For my own part, though it were my sole purpose, in recurring to a version, to refute the absurdities and corruptions of Popery, I should not desire other or better arguments than those I am supplied with by that very version, which one of their own councils has declared authentical.

§ 8. I AM not ignorant that a few passages have been produced, wherein the Vulgate and the original convey different meanings, and wherein the meaning of the Vulgate appears to favour the abuses established in that church. Some of these, but neither many, nor of great moment, are no doubt corruptions in the text, probably not intentional, but accidental, to which the originals in Hebrew and Greek have been in like manner liable, and from which no ancient book exant can be affirmed to be totally exempted. With respect to others of them, they will be found, upon a nearer inspection, as little favourable to Romish superstition, as the common reading in the Hebrew or the Greek. What is justly rendered, in our version, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel**, is in such a manner translated,

* Gen. iii. 15.

ted in the Vulgate, as to afford ſome colour for the extraordinary honors paid the virgin mother of our Lord. *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et ſemen tuum et ſemen illius. Ipſa conteret caput tuum, et tu inſidiaberis calcaneo ejus.* "She ſhall bruiſe thy head." In this way it has been underſtood by ſome of their capital painters, who, in their pictures of the Virgin, have repreſented her treading on a ſerpent. It is, however, certain, that their beſt critics admit this to be an error, and recur to ſome ancient manuſcripts of the Vulgate, which read *ipſum*, not *ipſa*.

A ſtill groſſer blunder, which ſeems to give countenance to the worſhip of relics, is in the paſſage thus rendered by our interpreters: *By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, bleſſed both the ſons of Joſeph; and worſhipped, leaning upon the top of his ſtaff**: in the Vulgate thus: *Fide Jacob moriens ſingulos filiorum Joſeph benedixit, et adoravit faſtigium virgæ ejus;* "adored the top of his rod;" as the verſion made from the Vulgate by Engliſh Romaniſts, and publiſhed at Rheims, expreſſes it. But the beſt judges among Roman Catholics admit, that the Latin text is not entire in this place, and that there has been an accidental omiſſion of the prepoſition, through the careleſsneſs of tranſcribers. For they have not now a writer of any name who infers, from the declaration of authenticity, either the infallibility of the tranſlator, or the exactneſs of the copiers. Houbigant, a prieſt of the Oratory, has not been reſtrained, by that ſentence, from making a new tranſlation of the Old Teſtament from the Hebrew into Latin, wherein he uſes as much freedom with the Vulgate, in correcting what appeared to him faulty in it, as any reaſonable Proteſtant, in this country, would do with the common Engliſh tranſlation. Nay, which is more extraordinary, in the execution of this work, he had the countenance of the then reigning pontiff. In his verſion he has corrected the paſſage quoted from Geneſis, and ſaid, "*Illud* (not *illa*) "conteret caput tuum." I make no doubt that he would have corrected the other paſſage alſo, if he had made a verſion of the New Teſtament.

§ 9. I KNOW it has alſo been urged, that there are ſome things in the Vulgate, which favour the ſtyle and doctrine of Rome, particularly in what regards the ſacraments; and that ſuch things are to be found in places when there is no ground to ſuſpect a various reading, nor that the text of the Vulgate has undergone any alteration, either intentional or accidental. Could this point be evinced in a ſatisfactory manner, it would allow more to Popery, on the ſcore of antiquity, than, in my opinion, ſhe is entitled to. It is true, that marriage appears, in one paſſage, to be called a ſacrament. Paul, after recommending the duties of huſbands and wives, and enforcing his recommendations by the reſemblance which marriage bears to the relation ſubſiſting between Chriſt and his church, having quoted theſe words from Moſes, *For this cauſe ſhall a man leave his father and mother, and ſhall be joined unto his wife, and they two ſhall be one fleſh*; adds, as it is expreſſed in the Vulgate, *Sacramentum hoc magnum eſt, ego autem dico in Chriſto et in eccleſia* †; as expreſſed in the Engliſh tranſlation, *This is a great myſtery; but I ſpeak concerning Chriſt and the Church*; which is in effect, as I had occaſion to obſerve in the preceding Diſſertation, to which I refer the reader ‡. 'This is capable of an important and figurative interpretation, I mean, as it relates to Chriſt and the church.' Under the Moſaic economy, the relation wherein God ſtood to Iſrael, is often repreſented under the figure of marriage; and it is common, with the penmen of the New Teſtament, to tranſfer thoſe images whereby the union between God and his people is illuſtrated in the Old, to that which ſubſiſts between Chriſt and his church. It is evident that, by the Latin word *ſacramentum*, the Greek μυστηριον is frequently rendered in the New Teſtament; and it is no leſs evident, not only from the application of the word in that verſion, but from the general uſe of it, in eccleſiaſtical writers, in the primitive ages, that it often denoted no more than an allegorical or figurative meaning, which may be aſſigned to any narrative or injunction; a meaning more ſublime than that which is at firſt ſuggeſted by the words. Thus the moral conveyed under an apologue or parable was with them the *ſacrament*, that is, the hidden meaning of the apologue or parable. Thus, in *ego dicam tibi ſacramentum mulieris et beſtiæ quæ portat eam* §, I will tell thee the myſtery of the woman, and of the beaſt which carrieth her; it is indubitable, that μυστηριον, or *ſacramentum*, means the hidden meaning of that viſion. It is very plain that, in their uſe, the ſenſe of the word *ſacramentum* was totally different from that which it has at preſent, either among Proteſtants or among Papiſts ‖. At the ſame time, there can be no queſtion, that the miſunderſtanding of the paſſage quoted above, from the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, has given riſe to the exaltation of matrimony into a ſacrament. Such are the effects of the perverſion of words, through the gradual change of cuſtoms; a perverſion incident to every language, but which no tranſlator can foreſee.

No more is their doctrine of merit ſupported by the following expreſſion: *Talibus hoſtiis promeretur Deus* ¶; which, though faulty in point of purity, means no more than is expreſſed in the Engliſh tranſlation, in theſe words: *With ſuch ſacrifices God is well pleaſed.*

* Heb. xi. 21. † Eph. v. 32. ‡ Diſſ. IX. Part I. § 7, 8. § Rev. xvii. 7. ‖ Diſſ. IX. Part I. ¶ Heb. xiii. 16.

pleaſed. It is, by common uſe, and not by ſcholaſtic quibbles, that the language of the ſacred writers ought to be interpreted. Again, the command which ſo often occurs in the Goſpels, *pœnitentiam agite*, ſeems at firſt to favour the Popiſh doctrine of *penance*. In conformity to this idea, the Rhemiſh tranſlators render it *do penance*. But nothing is more evident, than that this is a perverſion of the phraſe from its ancient meaning, occaſioned by the corruptions which have inſenſibly crept into the church. That the words, as uſed by the Latin tranſlator, meant originally as much, at leaſt, as the Engliſh word *repent*, cannot admit a queſtion; and thus much is allowed by the critics of that communion. In this manner Maldonat, a learned Jeſuit, in his Commentary *, explains *pœnitentiam agite*, as of the ſame import with *parate vias Domini, rectas facite ſemitas ejus;* and both as ſignifying *Relinquite errores et ſequimini veritatem; diſcedite a malo, et facite bonum*. He underſtood no otherwiſe the *agite pœnitentiam* of the Latin tranſlator, than we underſtand the μετανοειτε of the Evangeliſt. Accordingly, the ſame Greek word is in one place of that verſion rendered *pœnitemini* †. But the introduction of the doctrine of auricular confeſſion, of the neceſſity for obtaining abſolution, of ſubmitting to the puniſhment preſcribed by the prieſt for the ſins confeſſed, which they have come to denominate *pœnitentia*, and their ſtyling the whole of this inſtitution of theirs the *ſacrament of penance*, which is of a much later date than that verſion, has diverted men's minds from attending to the primitive and only proper import of the phraſe. *Agite pœnitentiam* was not, therefore, originally a miſ-tranſlation of the Greek μετανοειτε, though not ſufficiently expreſſive; but the abuſe which has gradually taken place in the Latin church, and the miſapplication of the term which it has occaſioned, have in a manner juſtled out the original meaning, and rendered the words, in their preſent acceptation, totally improper ‡.

§ 10. SEVERAL other words and expreſſions give ſcope for the like obſervations. But, after what has been ſaid, it is not neceſſary to enter further into particulars. The Vulgate may reaſonably be pronounced, upon the whole, a good and faithful verſion. That it is unequal in the ſtyle, in reſpect both of purity and of perſpicuity, is very evident; nay, to ſuch a degree, as plainly to evince that it has not all iſſued from the ſame pen. Conſidered in groſs, we have reaſon to think it greatly inferior to Jerom's tranſlation, as finiſhed by himſelf. I may add, we have reaſon alſo to conſider the verſion which Jerom actually made, as greatly inferior to what he could have made, and would have made, if he had thought himſelf at liberty to follow entirely his own judgment, and had not been much reſtrained by the prejudices of the people. I have already obſerved the advantages redounding to the critic from the uſe of this verſion, which are in ſome degree peculiar. I ſhall only add, that its language, barbarous as it often is, has its uſe in aſſiſting us to underſtand more perfectly the Latin eccleſiaſtical writers of the early ages.

PART IV.

Strictures on Caſtalio.

HAVING ſhown, that it is impoſſible to do juſtice to an author, or to his ſubject, by attempting to track him, and always to be found in his footſteps, I ſhall now animadvert a little on thoſe tranſlators who are in the oppoſite extreme; whoſe manner is ſo looſe, rambling, and deſultory that, though they move nearly in the ſame direction with their author, pointing to the ſame object, they keep ſcarcely within ſight of his path. Of the former exceſs, Arias Montanus is a perfect model: the Vulgate is often too much ſo. Of the latter, the moſt remarkable example we have in Latin, is Caſtalio. Yet Caſtalio's work is no paraphraſe, ſuch as we have ſometimes ſeen under the name of *liberal tranſlations*: for in theſe, there are always interwoven with the thoughts of the author, thoſe of his interpreter, under the notion of their importance, either for illuſtrating, or for enforcing, the ſentiments of the original. The paraphraſt does not confine himſelf to the humble taſk of the tranſlator, who propoſes to exhibit, pure and unmixed, the ſentiments of another, clothed, indeed, in a different dreſs,

* On Matth. vii. 15. † Mark, i. 15. ‡ For further illuſtration on this article ſee Diſſ. XI. Part II. § 4.

dreſs, namely, ſuch as the country, into which he introduces them, can ſupply him with. The paraphraſt, on the contrary, claims to ſhare with the author in the merit of the work, not in reſpect of the language merely, for to this every interpreter has a claim, but in reſpect of what is much more important, the ſenſe: nay, further, if the ſentiments of theſe two happen to jar, no uncommon caſe, it is eaſy to conjecture whoſe will predominate in the paraphraſe. But it is not with paraphraſts that I have here to do. A looſe manner of tranſlating is ſometimes adopted, not for the ſake of inſinuating, artfully, the tranſlator's opinions, by blending them with the ſentiments of the author, but merely for the ſake of expreſſing with elegance, and in an oratorical manner, the ſenſe of the original.

§ 2. THIS was acknowledged to be in a high degree Caſtalio's object in tranſlating. He had obſerved, with grief, that great numbers were withheld from reading the Scriptures, that is, the Vulgate, the only verſion of any account then extant, by the rudeneſs, as well as the obſcurity, of the ſtyle. To give the public a Bible more elegantly and perſpicuouſly written, he conſidered as at leaſt an innocent, if not a laudable artifice, for inducing ſtudents, eſpecially thoſe of the younger ſort, to read the Scriptures with attention, and to throw aſide books full of indecencies then much in vogue, becauſe recommended by the beauty and ornaments of language. "Cupiebam," ſays he *, "extare Latiniorem aliquam, necnon fide-"liorem, et magis perſpicuam ſacrarum literarum "tranſlationem, ex qua poſſet eadem opera pietas "cum Latino ſermone diſci, ut hac ratione et tempori "conſuleretur, et homines ad legenda ſacra pellice-"rentur." The motive was ſurely commendable; and the reaſon whereon it was founded, a general diſuſe of the Scriptures, on account of the badneſs of their language, is but too notorious. Cardinal Bembo, a man of ſome note and literature under the pontificate of Leo X. in whoſe time the Reformation commenced, is ſaid to have expreſſed himſelf ſtrongly on this ſubject, that he durſt not read the Bible, for fear of corrupting his ſtyle; an expreſſion which had a very unfavourable aſpect, eſpecially in a churchman. Nevertheleſs, when we conſider, that by the Bible he meant the Vulgate, and by his ſtyle, his Latinity, this declaration will not be found to merit all the cenſure which Brown †, and others, have beſtowed upon it. For ſurely no one who underſtands Latin, will ſay, that he wiſhes to form his ſtyle in that language on the Vulgate. Nor does any reflection on the language of that tranſlation affect, in the ſmalleſt degree, the ſacred writers. The character of Moſes's ſtyle, in particular, is ſimplicity, ſerioufneſs, perſpicuity, and purity. The firſt and ſecond of theſe qualities are, in general, well exhibited in the Vulgate; the third is ſometimes violated, and the fourth often.

§ 3. BUT to return to Caſtalio: he was not entirely diſappointed in his principal aim. Many Romaniſts, as well as Proteſtants, who could not endure the foreign idioms and obſcurity of the Vulgate, attracted by the fluency, the perſpicuity, and partly, no doubt, by the novelty of Caſtalio's diction, as employed for conveying *the mind of the Spirit*, were delighted with the performance; whilſt the ſame quality of novelty, along with what looked like affectation in the change, exceedingly diſguſted others. One thing is very evident, in regard to this tranſlator, that when his work firſt made its appearance, nobody ſeemed to judge of it with coolneſs and moderation. Almoſt every perſon either admired or abhorred it. At this diſtant period, there is a greater probability of judging equitably, than there was when it was firſt publiſhed, and men's paſſions, from the circumſtances of the times, were ſo liable to be inflamed, on every new topic of diſcuſſion, wherein religion was concerned.

§ 4. IF we examine this work by the three great ends of tranſlating, above obſerved, we ſhall be qualified to form ſome judgment of his merit in this department. As to the firſt and principal end, conveying the true ſenſe of his author, I think he has ſucceeded, at leaſt, as well as moſt other tranſlators into Latin, and better than ſome of thoſe who, with much virulence, traduced his character and decried his work. He had, indeed, one great advantage, in being an excellent linguiſt, and knowing more of the three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, than moſt of the critics of his time. But that his immoderate paſſion for claſſical elocution, did ſometimes lead him to adopt expreſſions which were feeble, obſcure, and improper, is very certain. And it muſt be owned, notwithſtanding his plauſible defence, that Beza had reaſon to affirm, that the words ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησε λυτρωσιν τῳ λαῳ αὐτης ‡, are but ambiguouſly and frigidly rendered, *qui populi ſui liberationem procuret*. The difference is immenſe, between the notions of Pagans concerning the agency of their gods in human affairs, and the ideas which Scripture gives us of the divine efficiency; and, therefore, even Cicero, in a caſe of this kind, is no authority. The following inſtance, cited by Houbigant, is an example of obſcurity ariſing from the ſame cauſe §: *Tu iſti populo terræ hæreditatem hercifceris* ‖. *Hercifco* is merely a juridical term, which, though it might have been proper, in a treatiſe on

* Caſt. Defenſ. Tranſlat. &c. † Eſſays on the Characteriſtics. ‡ Luke i. 68. § Proleg. ‖ Joſh. xi. 6.

on the civil law, or in pleading in a court of judicature, no Roman author, of any name, would have uſed, in a work intended for the people. But, to no ſort of ſtyle are technical terms more unſuitable than to that of holy writ. It was the more inexcuſable, in this place, where the ſimple and natural expreſſion was ſo obvious. *Tu terram—dabis iſti populo poſſidendam.* Whereas, the phraſe which Caſtalio has adopted, would have probably been unintelligible to the much greater part of the people, even in Rome, at the time when Latin was their mother-tongue.

§ 5. As to the ſecond object of tranſlating, the conveyance of the ſpirit and manner of the author, in a juſt exhibition of the character of his ſtyle; I hinted before that, in this particular, he failed *entirely*, and I may even add *intentionally*. The firſt characteriſtical quality of the hiſtoric ſtyle of holy writ, *ſimplicity*, he has totally renounced. The ſimple ſtyle is oppoſed both to the complex, and to the highly ornamented. The complex is, when the diction abounds in periods, or in ſentences conſiſting of ſeveral members artfully combined. This is much the manner of Caſtalio, but far from that of the ſacred hiſtorians. In a former Diſſertation *, I gave a ſpecimen of this difference, in his manner of rendering the firſt five verſes of Geneſis. Now, for the transformation he has made them undergo, he has no excuſe, from either neceſſity or perſpicuity. The ſimple ſtyle will ſuit any tongue (though the complex will not always), and is remarkably perſpicuous. His affecting ſo often, without any neceſſity, to give, in the way of narrative, what, in the original, is in the way of dialogue, is another flagrant violation of ancient ſimplicity.

Nor is ſimplicity alone hurt by this change. How cold and inanimate, as well as indefinite, is the oblique but claſſical turn, which Caſtalio has endeavoured to give to Laban's ſalutation of Abraham's ſervant: *Eumque a Jova ſalvere juſſum, hortatur, ne foris maneat:* compared with the direct and vivid addreſs in the Vulgate, literally from the Hebrew: *Dixitque, Ingredere, benedicte Domini: cur foris ſtas?* Or, as it is in the Engliſh tranſlation, *Come in, thou bleſſed of the Lord: wherefore ſtandeſt thou without†?* That he tranſgreſſes, in this reſpect alſo, by a profuſion of ornament, is undeniable. By his accumulated diminutives, both in names and epithets, in the manner of Catullus, intended ſurely to be ornamental, he has injured the dignity, as well as the ſimplicity and ſeriouſneſs, of Solomon's Song.

Another ornament, in the ſame taſte, by which the ſimplicity of the ſacred writers has been greatly hurt in his tranſlation, is the attempt, when the ſame ideas recur, of expreſſing them almoſt always in different words and varied phraſes. It is not only eſſential to the ſimplicity, but it adds to the majeſty, of the inſpired penmen, that there never appears, in them, any ſolicitude about their words. No purſuit of variety, or, indeed, of any thing in point of diction out of the common road. Very different is the manner of this interpreter. I had occaſion to remark before ‡, that there were no fewer than ſeven or eight phraſes, employed by Caſtalio, in different places of the New Teſtament, for expreſſing the import of the ſingle verb μετανοεω, though uſed always in the ſame acceptation. And, as another ſpecimen of this inordinate paſſion, I ſhall add, that to expreſs διωγμος, he uſes, beſide the word *perſequutio*, the far too general terms, *vexatio, afflictio, inſectatio, adverſa, res adverſæ.* Nay, in ſome inſtances, his love of variety has carried him ſo far as to ſacrifice, not barely the ſtyle of his author, but his ſenſe. What can be a ſtronger example of it, than his denominating God, *Deus obtrectator* ||, rather than recur, with his author, to any term he had employed before. For the Hebrew קנא *kone*, rendered *jealous* in the Engliſh tranſlation, he had uſed, in one place, *æmulus*, in another, *ſocii impatiens*, and in a third *rivalis impatiens.* Though ſome exception might be made to the two laſt, the firſt was as good as the language afforded. Another tranſlator would not have thought there was any occaſion for a fourth; but ſo differently thought our claſſical interpreter, in matters of this kind, that he preferred a moſt improper word, which might contribute to give his ſtyle the graces of novelty and variety, to an appoſite, but more common term, which he had employed before. The word *obtrectator* is never uſed, as far as I remember, but in a bad ſenſe. It is acknowledged, that when jealouſy is aſcribed to God, the expreſſion is not ſtrictly proper. He is ſpoken of after the manner of men. But then the term, by itſelf, does not imply any thing vicious. We may ſay of a man properly, in certain caſes, that he had reaſon to be *jealous;* but with no propriety can we ſay, in any caſe, that a man had reaſon to be *envious*, that he had reaſon to be *calumnious.* Theſe epithets are better ſuited to the diabolical nature, than to the divine. Yet both are included in the word *obtrectator.*

In ſhort, his affectation of the manner of ſome of the poets and orators, has metamorphoſed the authors he interpreted, and ſtript them of the venerable ſignatures of antiquity, which ſo admirably befit them; and which, ſerving as intrinſic evidence of their authenticity, recommended their writings to the ſerious and judicious. Whereas, when accoutred in this new faſhion, nobody would imagine them to have been Hebrews; and yet (as ſome critics have juſtly remarked), it

* Diſſ. III. § 4. † Gen. xxiv. 31. ‡ Diſſ. VI. Part III. § 11. || Joſh. xxiv. 19.

it has not been within the compaſs of Caſtalio's art, to make them look like Romans.

§ 6. I AM far from thinking that Caſtalio merited, on this account, the bitter invectives vented againſt him by Beza, and others, as a wilful corrupter of the word of God. His intention was good; it was to entice all ranks, as much as poſſible, to the ſtudy of the divine oracles. The expedient he uſed appeared, at leaſt, harmleſs. It was in his judgment, at the worſt, but like that which Horace obſerves, was often practiſed by good-natured teachers:

Ut pueris olim dant cruſtula blandi
Doctores, elementa velint ut diſcere prima.

He regarded the thoughts ſolely as the reſult of inſpiration, the words and idiom as merely circumſtantial. "Erant Apoſtoli," ſays he *, "natu Hebræi: et peregrina, hoc eſt Græca lingua ſcribentes hebraizabant; non quod id juberet ſpiritus: neque enim pluris facit ſpiritus Hebraiſmos quam Græciſmos." Indeed, if the liberty Caſtalio has taken with the diction, had extended no further than to reject thoſe Hebraiſms which, how perſpicuous ſoever they are in the original, occaſion either obſcurity or ambiguity, when verbally tranſlated, and to ſupply their place, by ſimple expreſſions, in the Latin idiom, clearly conveying the ſame ſenſe, no perſon who is not tinctured with the cabaliſtical ſuperſtition of the Jews, could have cenſured his conduct.

Very often, the freedoms he uſed with the ſtyle of the ſacred penmen, aimed no higher. Thus, the expreſſion of the Prophet, which is, literally, in Engliſh, *My beloved had a vineyard in a horn of the ſon of oil*; and which is rendered in the Vulgate, *Vinea facta eſt dilecto meo in cornu filio olei*; Caſtalio has tranſlated much better, becauſe intelligibly, *Habebat amicus meus vineam in quondam pingui dorſo.* Had he uſed the more familiar term, *collis*, inſtead of *dorſum*, it would have been ſtill better. The Engliſh tranſlation expreſſes the ſenſe very properly, *My well beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill* †. But as I have ſhown, the freedoms taken by Caſtalio went ſometimes a great deal further than this, and tended to leſſen the reſpect due to the ſacred oracles, by putting them too much on a footing with compoſitions merely human, and by changing their ſerious manner for one comparatively light and trifling, nay, even playful and childiſh.

§ 7. As to the other two qualities of the hiſtorical ſtyle of Scripture, perſpicuity and purity, he ſeems in general to have been obſervant of them. To the latter he is cenſured chiefly for having ſacrificed too much. Yet his attention to this quality has proved a principal means of ſecuring his perſpicuity; as it is certain that the exceſſive attempts of others to preſerve in their verſion the oriental idiom, have both rendered the plaineſt paſſages unintelligible, and given bad Latin for what was good Hebrew or Chaldee. The example laſt quoted is an evidence of this; and ſurely none can doubt that it has more perſpicuity, as well as propriety, to ſay in Latin, *ut nemo uſque evaderet* with Caſtalio, than to ſay, *ut non fieret ſalva omnis caro* with the Vulgate: and, *Nulla res eſt quam Deus facere non poſſit* with the former, than *non erit impoſſible apud Deum omne verbum* with the latter. Nevertheleſs, in a few inſtances, an immoderate paſſion for claſſical phraſeology has, as we have ſeen, betrayed him into obſcurities, and even blunders, of which inferior interpreters were in no danger.

§ 8. To illuſtrate the different effects on the appearance of the ſacred penmen, produced by the oppoſite modes of tranſlating, which Arias and Caſtalio have adopted, I ſhall employ a ſimilitude of which Caſtalio himſelf has given me the hint. In his epiſtle dedicatory to king Edward, he has theſe words: *Quod ad latinitatem attinet. eſt oratio nihil aliud quam rei quædam quaſi veſtis, et nos ſartores ſumus.* In conformity to this idea, I ſhould ſay that thoſe venerable writers the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, appear, in their own country, in a garb plain indeed, and even homely, but grave withal, decent, and well fitted to the wearers. Arias, intending to introduce them to the Latins, has to make them look as little as poſſible like other men, and, one would think, to frighten every body from deſiring their acquaintance, clothed them in filthy rags, which are indeed of Roman manufacture, but have no other relation to any thing worn in the country, being alike unfit for every purpoſe of decency and uſe. For ſurely that ſtyle is moſt aptly compared to tattered garments, in which the words can, by no rule of ſyntax in the language, be rendered coherent, or expreſſive of any ſenſe. Caſtalio, on the contrary, not ſatisfied that when abroad, they ſhould be gravely and properly habited, as they were at home, will have them tricked up in finery and lace, that they may appear like men of faſhion, and even make ſome figure in, what the world calls, good company. But, though I conſider both theſe interpreters as in extremes, I am far from thinking their performances are to be deemed, in any reſpect, equivalent. It is not in my power to diſcover a good uſe that can be made of Arias's verſion, unleſs to give

* Defenſ.

† Iſaiah v. 1.

ſome aſſiſtance to a ſchoolboy in acquiring the elements of the language. Caſtalio's with one great fault, has many excellent qualities.

§ 9. In regard to the third object of tranſlating, which is to write ſo far properly and agreeably in the language into which the tranſlation is made, as may, independently of its exactneſs, ſerve to recommend it as a valuable work in that tongue; if Caſtalio failed here, he has been particularly unlucky, ſince the latinity and elegance of the work muſt, by his own acknowledgment, have been more an object to him than to other tranſlators, this being the great means by which he wanted to draw the attention of the youth of that age to the ſtudy of the holy Scriptures. But however much his taſte may, in this reſpect, have been adapted to the times wherein he lived, we cannot conſider it as perfectly chaſte and faultleſs. Sufficient grounds for this cenſure may be collected from the remarks already made. The ſuperficial and the ſhining qualities of ſtyle ſeem often to have had more attractions with him than the ſolid and the uſeful.

§ 10. In other reſpects he appears to have been well qualified for the taſk of tranſlating. Converſant in the learned languages, poſſeſſed of a good underſtanding and no inconſiderable ſhare of critical acuteneſs, candid in his diſpoſition, and not over-confident of his own abilities, or exceſſively tenacious of his own opinion, he was ever ready to hearken, and, when convinced, to ſubmit to reaſon, whether preſented by a friend or by a foe, whether in terms of amity and love, or of reproach and hatred. Of this he gave very ample evidence in the corrections which he made on ſome of the later editions of his Bible.

He was far from pretending, like ſome interpreters and commentators, to underſtand every thing. When he was uncertain about the ſenſe, he could do no other than follow the words in tranſlating. This expreſſion of the Apoſtle Peter*, Εις τουτο γαρ και νεκροις ευηγγελισθη, ινα κριθωσι μεν κατα ανθρωπους σαρκι, ζωσι δε κατα Θεον πνευματι, he tranſlates in this manner, *Nam ideo mortuis quoque nunciatus eſt, ut et ſecundum homines carne judicentur, et ſecundum Deum ſpiritu vivant*; adding this note on the margin: *Hunc locum non intelligo, ideoque ad verbum tranſtuli.* There are ſeveral other ſuch inſtances. In one place he has on the margin: *Hos duos verſus non intelligo, ideoque de mea tranſlatione dubito*†. It is worth while to take notice of the manner in which he himſelf ſpeaks of ſuch paſſages: "Quod autem alicubi ſcribo, me aliquem "locum non intelligere: id non ita accipi volo, quaſi "cætera plane intelligam: ſed ut ſciatur, me in aliis "aliquid ſaltem obſcuræ lucis habere, in illis nihil: "tum autem ut meæ tranſlationi in quibuſdam hujuſ- "modi locis non nimium confidatur. Neque tamen "ubique quid non intelligam oſtendo: eſſet enim hoc "infinitum ‡."

§ 11. In regard to the changes he made in adopting claſſical terms inſtead of certain words and phraſes, which had been long in uſe amongſt eccleſiaſtic writers, and were ſuppoſed to be univerſally underſtood, I cannot agree entirely with, either his ſentiments, or thoſe of his adverſaries. In the firſt place, I do not think, as he ſeems once to have thought (though in this reſpect he afterwards altered his conduct, and conſequently, we may ſuppoſe, his opinion), that no word deſerved admiſſion into his verſion, which had not the ſanction of ſome Pagan claſſic. For this reaſon, the words *baptiſma*, *angelus*, *eccleſia*, *proſelytus*, *ſynagoga*, *prophetа*, *patriarcha*, *mediator*, *dæmoniacus*, *hypocrita*, *benedictus*, and the words *fides* and *fidelis*, when uſed in the theological ſenſe, he ſet aſide for *lotio*, *genius*, *reſpublica*, *adventitius*, *collegium*, *vates*, *ſummus pater*, *ſequeſter*, *furioſus*, *ſimulator*, *collaudandus*, *fiducia*, *fidens*. Some of the more uſual terms, as *angelus*, *baptiſma*, *eccleſia*, *ſynagoga*, were, in later editions, reſtored. In regard to ſome others, conſidering the plan he had adopted, his choice cannot be much blamed, as they were ſufficiently expreſſive of the ſenſe of the original. A few, indeed, were not ſo.

Genius is not a verſion of αγγελος, nor *furioſus* of δαιμονιζομενος. The notions entertained by the heathen of their *genii*, no more correſponded to the ideas of the Hebrews, in regard to *angels*, than the fancies which our anceſtors entertained of elves and fairies, correſponded to the Chriſtian doctrine concerning the heavenly inhabitants. Αγγελος was a literal verſion made by the Seventy into Greek, of the Hebrew מלאך *malach*, a name of office which, if Caſtalio after them had literally rendered into Latin, calling it *nuntius*, it would have been as little liable to exception, as his rendering the words βασιλευς and υπηρετης, *rex*, and *miniſter*. *Furioſus* is not a juſt tranſlation of δαιμονιζομενος. The import of the original name, which only ſuggeſts the cauſe, is confined, by the tranſlator's opinion, to the nature of the diſorder: *furioſus* means no more than *mad*, whereas δαιμονιζομενος is, repeatedly in Scripture, given as equivalent to διαμονιον εχων. Nor does the diſeaſe of thoſe unhappy perſons appear to have been always *madneſs*. And if in this, we regard etymology alone, the traditionary fables, about the three infernal goddeſſes, called

* 1 Pet. iv. 6. † Iſaiah xxvii. 6, 7. ‡ Ad lectores admonitio.

called *furies*, are noway ſuited to the ancient popular faith, of either Jews or Pagans, concerning demons. And, even though *adventitius* correſponds exactly in etymology with προσηλυτος, the Latin word does not convey the idea which, in the Helleniſtic idiom, is conveyed by the Greek. *Simulator.* can hardly be objected to, as a verſion of υποκριτης. In ſome inſtances, it anſwers better than *hypocrita*. This name is, in Latin, confined, by uſe, to thoſe who lead a life of diſſimulation in what regards religion; whereas the Greek term is ſometimes employed in the New Teſtament, in all the latitude in which we commonly uſe the word *diſſembler*, for one who is inſincere in a particular inſtance. But the claſſical word *collaudandus* does not ſuit the Greek ευλογητος as uſed in holy writ, near ſo well as does the eccleſiaſtical epithet *benedictus*. And *ſummus pater* is too indefinite a verſion of πατριαρχης.

It is a good rule, in every language, to take the neceſſary terms in every branch of knowledge or buſineſs, from thoſe beſt acquainted with that branch: becauſe, among them, the extent of the terms and their reſpective differences, will be moſt accurately diſtinguiſhed. In what, therefore, peculiarly concerned the undiſputed tenets, or rites, either of Judaiſm or of Chriſtianity, it was much more reaſonable to adopt the ſtyle uſed by Latin Jews or Chriſtians in thoſe early ages, before they were corrupted with philoſophy, than, with the aſſiſtance of but a remote analogy, to transfer terms uſed by Pagan writers, to the doctrines and ceremonies of a religion with which they were totally unacquainted. I muſt, therefore, conſider the rejection of ſeveral terms eſtabliſhed by eccleſiaſtic uſe, and conveying preciſely the idea intended by the ſacred penmen, as an indication of an exceſſive ſqueamiſhneſs in point of Latinity. Such terms, in my judgment, are, in matters of revelation, entitled even to be preferred to claſſical words. For, though the latter may nearly ſuit the idea, they cannot have, to the ſame degree as the former, the ſanction of uſe in that application.

§ 12. But, let be obſerved, on the other hand, that the preference abovementioned, is limited by this expreſs condition, that the eccleſiaſtic term, in its common acceptation, plainly convey to the reader the ſame idea which the original word, uſed by the ſacred penmen, was intended to convey to the readers for whom they they wrote. To plead, on the contrary, with Father Simon and others, for the preferable adoption of certain theologic words and phraſes conſecrated by long uſe, as they are pleaſed to term it, though admitted to be obſcure, ambiguous, or even improper, is to me the greateſt abſurdity. It is really to make the ſacred authors give place to their ancient interpreters: it is to throw away the ſenſe of the former in compliment to the words of the latter. We muſt ſurely conſider inſpiration as a thing of very little conſequence, when we ſacrifice it knowingly to human errors. This would, in effect, condemn all new tranſlations, whatever occaſions there might be for them, for correcting the faults of former verſions. But into the truth of this ſentiment I ſhall have occaſion to inquire more fully afterwards. Only let it be remembered, that the limitation now mentioned affects two claſſes of words, firſt, thoſe by which the original terms were early miſ-tranſlated; ſecondly, thoſe which, though at firſt they exhibited the true ſenſe of the original, have come gradually to convey a different meaning. For theſe, in conſequence of a change inſenſibly introduced in the application, are become now, whatever they were formerly, either improper or ambiguous.

There are ſome terms in the Vulgate which, in my judgment, were never perfectly adapted to thoſe in the original, in whoſe place they were ſubſtituted. Whether *ſacramentum* for μυστηριον were originally of this number or not, it is certain that the theological meaning, now conſtantly affixed to that word, does not ſuit the ſenſe of the ſacred authors, which is fully and intelligibly expreſſed in Latin, as Caſtalio and Houbigant have commonly done, by the word *arcanum*. The Vulgate ſometimes renders it *myſterium*, which is not much better than *ſacramentum*. For *myſterium*, not being Latin, and being variouſly uſed as a technical term by theologians, muſt be vague and obſcure. Many other latinized Greek words (as *ſcandalizo*, *blaſphemia*, *hæreſis*, *ſchiſma*) are in ſome meaſure liable to the ſame objection. The original terms are none of thoſe, which were obſerved formerly *, not to be ſuſceptible of a tranſlation into another language. And in that caſe to transfer the words, leaving them untranſlated, rarely fails either to keep the reader in ignorance, or to lead him into error. For this reaſon I am far from condemning with Boys, Simon, and ſome others, the modern tranſlators, particularly Caſtalio, for rendering them into proper Latin. I intend, in another Diſſertation, to evince that they would not have executed faithfully the office they had undertaken, if they had not done it. The words with which Caſtalio has commonly ſupplied us, inſtead of thoſe abovementioned (*officio*, *maledictum*, or *impia dicta*, *ſecta*, *diſſidium* or *factio*), are in general as appoſite for expreſſing the ſenſe of the original, as any other words of the ſame claſs. And even the Vulgate is not uniform in regard to thoſe words. Αιρεσις is, in ſeveral places of that verſion, rendered *ſecta*, and σχισμα *ſciſſura* and *diſſenſio*.

* Diſſ. II. Part. I. § 5.

diſſenſio. But of this I have treated already in the preceding Diſſertation.

§ 13. AFTER all the zeal Caſtalio has ſhown, and the ſtretches he has made for preſerving claſſical purity, could it have been imagined that he would have admitted into his verſion manifeſt barbariſms, both words and idioms of no authority whatever. Yet that he has afforded a few inſtances of this ſtrange inconſiſtency, is unqueſtionable. It would not be eaſy to aſſign a ſatisfactory reaſon for his rejecting the term *idolum* idol, a claſſical word, and uſed by Pagans in the ſame meaning in which it is uſed by us. If it be ſaid, that in their uſe, it was not accompanied with the ſame kind of ſentiment as when uſed by us; as much may be affirmed with truth of *Deus*, *Numen*, and every word that relates to religion, which could not fail to affect differently the mind of a heathen, from the way in which it affects the mind of a Jew or a Chriſtian. Ought we to have different names for the Pagan deities, Jupiter, Juno, &c. becauſe the mention of them was attended with reverence in Pagans, and with contempt in Chriſtians?

But what ſhall we ſay of his ſupplying *idolum* by a barbariſm of his own, *deaſter*, a word of no authority, ſacred or profane? It ſuited the fundamental principles of his undertaking to reject *idololatra* idolater, becauſe, though analogically formed from a good word, it could plead only eccleſiaſtic uſe. But by what principle he has introduced ſuch a monſter as *deaſtricola*, that was never heard of before, it would be impoſſible to ſay. He could be at no loſs for a proper expreſſion. *Idolorum* or *ſimulacrorum cultor* would have ſerved. He has given but too good reaſon, by ſuch uncouth ſounds as *deaſter*, *deaſtricola*, and *infidens* infidel, to ſay that his objections lay only againſt the liberties in language which had been taken by others. Caſtalio argues againſt barbariſms as being obſcure; ſurely this argument ſtrikes more againſt thoſe of his own coining, than againſt thoſe (if they can be called barbariſms) which are recommended by ſo long continued, and ſo extenſive, an uſe. For, though he ſhould not allow the uſe of theologians to be perfectly good, it is ſurely, on thoſe ſubjects, ſufficient for removing the objection of obſcurity. I do not ſee any thing in his work which has ſo much the appearance of ſelf-conceit as this. In other reſpects, I find him modeſt and unaſſuming. It has been alſo obſerved, that his idioms are not always pure. *Dominus, ad cujus normam* is not in the Latin idiom. *Norma legis* is proper, not *norma Dei*, or *norma hominis*. But this I conſider as an overſight, the other as affectation.

§ 14. I SHALL add a few words on the ſubject of Hebraiſms, which Caſtalio is accuſed of rejecting altogether. This charge he is ſo far from denying, that he endeavours to juſtify his conduct in this particular. Herein, I think, if his adverſaries went too far on one ſide, in prefering the mere form of the expreſſion, to the perſpicuous enunciation of the ſenſe; this interpreter went too far on the oppoſite ſide, as he made no account of giving to his verſion the ſtrong ſignatures which the original bears of the antiquity, the manners, and the character, of the age and nation of the writers. Yet both the credibility of the narrative, and the impreſſion which the ſentiments are adapted to make on the readers, are not a little affected by that circumſtance. That thoſe are in the worſe extreme of the two, who would ſacrifice perſpicuity and propriety (in other words, the ſenſe itſelf) to that circumſtance, is not indeed to be doubted. The patrons of the literal method do not advert that, by carrying the point too far, the very exhibition of the ſtyle and manner of the author, is, with both the other ends of tranſlating, totally annihilated. "Quo pertinent," ſays Houbigant*, iſtiuſmodi interpretationes, quæ nihil quidquam reſonant, niſi adhibes interpretis alterum interpretem?" Again, "Num proprietas hæc cenſenda eſt, quæ mihi exprimat obſcure ac inhumane, id quod ſacri ſcriptores, dilucide ac liberaliter expreſſerunt?" The ſentiments of this author, in regard to the proper mean between both extremes, as they ſeem entirely reaſonable, and equally applicable to any language (though expreſſed in reference to Latin verſions only), I ſhall ſubjoin to the foregoing obſervations on Caſtalio; "Utroque in genere tam metrico quam ſoluto, retinendas eſſe veteres loquendi formas, nec ab iſta linea unquam diſcendendum, niſi gravibus de cauſis, quæ quidem nobis eſſe tres videntur: primo, ſi Hebraiſmi veteres, cum retinentur, fiunt Latino in ſermone, vel obſcuri vel ambigui; ſecundo, ſi eorum ſignificantia minuitur, niſi circuitione quadam uteris; tertio, ſi vergant ad aliam, quam Hebraica verba, ſententiam.†"

§ 15. I SHALL finiſh my critique on this tranſlator, with ſome remarks on a charge brought againſt him by Beauſobre and Lenfant, who affirm ‡ that, abſtracting from the falſe elegance of his ſtyle, he takes greater liberty (they muſt certainly mean with the ſenſe) than a faithful interpreter ought to take. Of this his verſion of the following paſſage § is given as an example. Τυ επιστρεψαι απο σκοτους εις φως, και της εξουσιας του Σατανα επι τον Θεον, του λαβειν αυτους αφεσιν αμαρτιων, και κληρον εν τοις ηγιασμενοις, πιστει τη εις εμε; which is thus rendered

† Ibidem. ‡ Preface Generale, P. II. des Verſions du N. T. § Acts xxvi. 18.

rendered by Caſtalio: "Ut ex tenebris in lucem, et "ex Satanæ poteſtate ad Deam ſe convertant, et ita "peccatorum veniam, et eandem cum iis ſortem con-"ſequantur, qui fide mihi habenda ſancti facti fu-"erint:" and by Beza, whom they here oppoſe to him: "Et convertas eos a tenebris ad lucem, et a po-"teſtate Satanæ ad Deum, ut remiſſionem pecca-"torum et ſortem inter ſanctificatos accipiant per fi-"dem quæ eſt in me." In my opinion there is a real ambiguity in the original, which if Caſtalio be blameable for fixing, in one way, Beza is not leſs blameable for fixing it in another. The words πιστει τη εις εμε, may be conſtrued with the verb λαβειν at ſome diſtance, or with the participle ἡγιασμενοις immediately preceding. In the common way of reckoning, if one of theſe methods were to be ſtyled a ſtretch, or a liberty, it would be Beza's, and not Caſtalio's, both becauſe the latter keeps cloſer to the arrangment of the original, and becauſe the Apoſtle, not having uſed the adjective ἁγιοις, but the participle ἡγιασμενοις, gives ſome ground to regard the following words as its regimen. Accordingly, Beza has conſidered the verſion of Eraſmus, which is to the ſame purpoſe with Caſtalio's, and with which the Figurine verſion alſo agrees; "ut accipiant remiſſionem peccatorum, et ſortem in-"ter eos qui ſanctificati ſunt, per fidem quæ eſt erga "me; as exhibiting a ſenſe quite different from his own;" at the ſame time, he freely acknowledges, that the original is ſuſceptible of either meaning. "Τη "πιστει. Poteſt quidem hoc referri ad participium "ἡγιασμενοις, quemadmodum retulit Eraſmus." In this inſtance Beza, though not remarkable for moderation, has judged more equitably than the French tranſlators above mentioned, who had no reaſon to reaſon to affirm, dogmatically, that the words ought to be joined in the one way, and not in the other; or to conclude that Caſtalio affected to give the words this turn, in order to exclude the idea of *abſolute election*. Did the Engliſh tranſlators, for this purpoſe, render the paſſage after Eraſmus and Caſtalio, not after Beza, *That they may receive forgiveneſs of ſins, and inheritance among them which are ſanctified by faith that is in me?* Nobody, I dare ſay, will ſuſpect it.

I cannot help thinking thoſe critics unlucky in their choice of an example: for had there been more to ſay, in oppoſition to this verſion of the paſſage, than has yet been urged, it would ſtill have been hard to treat that as a liberty peculiar to Caſtalio, in which he was evidently not the firſt, and in which he has had the concurrence of more tranſlators than can be be produced on the other ſide. For my part, as I acknowledge that ſuch tranſpoſitions are not unfrequent in holy writ, my opinion is, that the connection and ſcope of the place ought chiefly to determine us in doubtful caſes. In the preſent caſe, it appears to me to yield the cleareſt ſenſe, and to be every way the moſt eligible, to join the words πιστει τη εις εμε neither to ἡγιασμενοις, nor to λαβειν, but to the foregoing verb επιστρεψαι; for when the regimen is thrown to the end of the ſentence, it is better to join it to the firſt verb, with which it can be ſuitably conſtrued, than to an intermediate verb, explicative of the former. Nothing can give a more plain, or a more oppoſite, meaning than the words under examination, thus conſtrued; *To bring them by the faith that is in me* (that is, by my doctrine, the faith, ἡ πιστις being often uſed by the ſacred writers for the object of faith, or *thing believed*), *from darkneſs to light*, &c.

§ 16. THUS, I have endeavoured to examine, with impartiality, Caſtalio's character as a tranſlator without aſſuming the province of either the accuſer or the apologiſt. I have neither exaggerated, nor extenuated, either his faults or his virtues, and can pronounce truly, upon the whole, that though there are none (Arias and Pagnin excepted), whole general manner of tranſlating is more to be diſapproved; I know not any by which a ſtudent may be more aſſiſted in attaintaing the true ſenſe of many places, very obſcure in moſt tranſlations, than by Caſtalio's.

PART V.

Strictures on Beza.

BEZA, the celebrated Geneva tranſlator of the New Teſtament, cannot be accuſed of having gone to either of the extremes in which we find Arias and Caſtalio. In general, he is neither ſervilely literal, barbarous, and unintelligible, with the former; nor does he appear aſhamed of the unadorned ſimplicity

plicity of the original, with the latter. It was, therefore, at firſt, my intention not to criticiſe his verſion, no more than to inquire into the manner of all the Latin tranſlators of ſacred writ, but barely to point out the moſt egregious faults in the plan of tranſlating ſometimes adopted, ſpecifying, in the way of example and illuſtration, thoſe verſions only, wherein ſuch faults were moſt conſpicuous. On more mature reflection, I have judged it proper to beſtow a few thoughts on Beza, as his tranſlation has, in a great meaſure, been made the ſtandard of moſt of the tranſlations of the reformed churches (I do not include the Lutheran) into modern tongues. He has, perhaps, had leſs influence on the Engliſh tranſlators, than on thoſe of other countries; but he has not been entirely without influence, even on them. And though he writes with a good deal of purity and clearneſs, without florid and oſtentatious ornaments; ther are ſome faults, which it is of great moment to avoid, and which he is, upon the whole, more chargeable than any tranſlator of the New Teſtament I know.

§ 2. His verſion of the New Teſtament is nearly in the ſame taſte with that of the Old, by Junius and Tremelius, but better executed. Theſe two tranſlations are commonly bound together, to complete the verſion of holy writ. Junius and Tremellius have been accuſed of obtruding upon the ſacred text, a number of pronouns, *illi*, *hic*, and *iſte*, for which the original gives no warrant. Their excuſe was, that the Latin has not articles, as the Hebrew, and that there is no other way of ſupplying the articles, but by prononouns. But it may with reaſon be queſtioned, whether it were not better, except in a few caſes, to leave them unſupplied, than to ſubſtitute what may darken the expreſſion, and even render it more indefinite, nay, what may ſometimes alter the ſenſe. At the ſame time, I acknowledge that there are caſes in which this method is entirely proper. In the addition of an emphatic epithet, the article is fitly ſupplied by the pronoun. Thus the words, Επεσε Βαβυλων ἡ πολις μεγαλη *, are juſtly tranſlated by Beza, *Cecidit Babylon urbs illa magna*: and the expreſſion uſed by Nathan to David, *Thou art the man* †, is properly rendered by Junius, *Tu vir ille es*. The neceſſity of recurring to the pronoun, in theſe inſtances, has been perceived alſo by the old tranſlator and Caſtalio.

Nor are theſe the only caſes wherein the Greek or Hebrew article may, not only in Latin, but even in Engliſh, which has articles, be rendered properly by the pronoun. For example, a particular ſpecies is diſtinguiſhed from others of the ſame genus, by ſome attributive conjoined with it; but when the occaſion of mentioning that ſpecies ſoon recurs, the attributive is ſufficiently ſupplied by the article; and, in ſuch inſtances, it often happens, that the article is beſt ſupplied, in another language, by the pronoun. In the queſtion put to our Lord, Τι αγαθον ποιησω, ἱνα ἐχω ζωην αἰωνιον ‡, a ſpecies of life to which the queſtion relates, is diſtinguiſhed from all others, by the epithet αἰωνιον. The article would contribute nothing here to the diſtinction. But when, in the anſwer §, the ſame ſubject is referred to, the epithet is dropped, and the article is prefixed to ζωην, which aſcertains the meaning with equal perſpicuity, Ει δε θελεις εισελθειν εις την ζωην I have ſeen no Latin tranſlation, no not Beza's, which renders it, *Si vis invitam illam ingredi*; and yet it is evident, that ſuch is, in this paſſage, the force of the article. The Engliſh idiom rarely permits us to give articles to abſtract nouns. For this reaſon, it would not be a juſt expreſſion of the ſenſe to ſay, *If thou wouldſt enter into the life*, to wit, *eternal life*, the life enquired about. Our only way of marking the reference to the queſtion, is, by ſaying, *If thou wouldſt enter into that life*. As, in French, the article is, on the contrary, added to all abſtract nouns, the pronoun is equally neceſſary with them as with us, for making the diſtinction. There is, beſides, ſomething like an impropriety in ſaying to the living, *If thou wouldſt enter into life*.

But there are unqueſtionably, caſes in which the Geneveſe interpreters employ the pronoun unneceſſarily, aukwardly, and even improperly. *In that day ſhall the deaf hear the words of the book* ||, ſay the Engliſh tranſlators. *Audient die illa ſurdi iſti verba literarum*, ſay Junius and his aſſociate. Any perſon who underſtands Latin, on hearing the verſe read by itſelf, will ſuppoſe that there muſt have been mention of ſome deaf perſons in the foregoing verſes, to which the pronoun *iſti*, in this verſe, has a reference. But, on inquiry, he will find there is no ſuch thing; and that it is deaf perſons in general of whom the Prophet ſpeaks. The introduction of the pronoun, therefore, ſerves only to miſlead. *Matthæus ille publicanus* ¶, in Beza's verſion, evidently ſuggeſts, that Matthew was a man famous as a publican, before he became an Apoſtle. In ſome places, it not only appears aukward, but injures the ſimplicity of the ſtyle. Junius ſays, in his account of the creation, *Dixit Deus, Eſto lux, et fuit lux; viditque Deus lucem hanc eſſe bonam: et diſtinctionem fecit Deus inter hanc lucem et tenebras* **. Here, I think, the pronoun is not only unneceſſary and affected

* Rev. xiv. 8. † 2 Sam. xii, 7. ‡ Matth. xix. 16. § 17.
|| Iſaiah xxix. 18. ¶ Matth. x. 3. ** Gen. i. 3, 4.

affected, but ſuggeſts ſomething ridiculous, as if that light only had been diſtinguiſhed from darkneſs. However as *lux* is firſt mentioned, without an attendant, the pronoun which attends it, when mentioned afterwards, does not make the expreſſion ſo indefinite and obſcure as in the former example. But, when Beza makes the Evangeliſt ſay *, *Jonas genuit Jechoniam in tranſportatione illâ Babylonicâ; poſt autem tranſportationem illam Babylonicam, Jechonias genuit Salathielem*; what more is expreſſed, in relation to the period, than if he had ſaid ſimply, *in tranſportatione Babylonica et poſt tranſportationem Babylonicam?* The addition of this epithet makes the noun ſufficiently definite, without any pronoun. Nay, does not the pronoun, thus ſuperadded, ſuggeſt one of two things; either that the tranſportation, here referred to, had been mentioned in the preceding words, or that the hiſtorian meant to diſtinguiſh, out of ſeveral tranſportations, one more noted than the reſt? Now, neither of theſe was the caſe; no mention had been made before of the Babylonian tranſportation; and there were not more Babylonian tranſportations, or more tranſportations any whither, than one which the Jewiſh nation had undergone. With this fault Eraſmus alſo is chargeable, but much ſeldomer. Greek, as well as Hebrew, has an article, and ſo have modern languages. But, in tranſlating out of theſe into Latin, nobody, I believe, has ever, either before or ſince, thought of making the pronoun ſupply the article, except in a few ſpecial inſtances, ſuch as thoſe above excpted. In ſuch inſtances, I acknowledge, there is an evident propriety.

§ 3. BEZA, with natural talents conſiderably above the middle rate, had a good deal of learning, and underſtood well both Greek and Latin; but he neither knew Hebrew (though he had the aſſiſtance of ſome who knew it), nor does he ſeem to be much converſant in the tranſlation of the Seventy. Hence it has happened, that his critical acuteneſs is not always ſo well directed as it might have been. The ſignifications of words and idioms are often determined by him from claſſical authority, which might, with greater eaſe and more preciſion, have been aſcertained by the uſage of the ſacred writers, and their ancient interpreters. As to words which do not occur in other Greek writers, are but rarely, or in a ſenſe manifeſtly different from what they bear in Scripture, Beza's chief aid was etymology. This has occaſioned his frequent recourſe, without neceſſity, to circumlocution, to the prejudice always of the diction, and ſometimes of the ſenſe. Examples of this we have in his manner of rendering σπλαγχνιζομαι †, κληρονομεω ‡, πληροφορεω §, συκοφαντεω ‖, χειροτονεω ¶, and ſeveral others. On the laſt of theſe, I ſhall ſoon have occaſion to make ſome remarks. For the other four, I ſhall only refer to my notes on thoſe paſſages in the Goſpels, where they occur as marked in the margin. It is, no doubt, to this attempt at tracing the origin of the words in his verſion, that he alludes in that expreſſion, *Verborum proprietatem ſtudioſe ſum ſectatus* **. This, however, has been ſhown not to be always the ſureſt method of attaining the ſignification wanted ††.

§ 4. BUT of all the faults with which Beza is chargeable as a tranſlator, the greateſt is, undoubtedly, that he was too violent a party-man to poſſeſs that impartiality, without which it is impoſſible to ſucceed as an interpreter of holy writ. It requires but a very little of a critical eye to diſcern in him a conſtant effort to accommodate the ſtyle of the ſacred writers to that of his ſect. Nay, what he has done in this way, is done ſo openly, I might have ſaid avowedly, that it is aſtoniſhing it has not more diſcredited his work.

In this particular, as in the application of the pronouns above mentioned, Junius and Tremellius have alſo juſtly fallen under the animadverſion of all impartial judges. What is thus well expreſſed in the Engliſh tranſlation, *They gave the ſenſe, and cauſed them to underſtand the reading* ‡‡, is rendered, by theſe interpreters, *Exponendo ſenſum dabant intelligentiam* PER SCRIPTURAM IPSAM. The three laſt words are an evident interpolation. There is no ellipſis in the ſentence: they are no way neceſſary; for the ſenſe is complete without them. But with them it is moſt unwarrantably limited to expreſs the private opinion of the tranſlators. I am as zealouſly attached as any man, to the doctrine that Scripture will ever be found its own beſt interpreter; an opinion which I have conſidered in a former Diſſertation §§, and which is ſufficiently ſupported by the principles of ſound criticiſm and common ſenſe. But no perſon can deteſt more ſtrongly a method of defending even a true opinion, ſo unjuſtifiable as that of foiſting it into the ſacred Scriptures. If any thing can ſerve to render a juſt ſentiment queſtionable, it is the detection of ſuch groſs unfairneſs, in the expedients employed for promoting it. Yet this has been copied into the Geneva French verſion, after it had received the corrections of Bertram, by whom it has been made to ſay, *Ils en donnoient l'intelligence, la faiſant entendre par l'ecriture meme.* It is but juſt to obſerve, that neither Olivetan the tranſlator, nor Calvin, who afterwards reviſed his work, had diſcovered any warrant for the laſt clauſe in the original, or had admitted it into the verſion.

The

* Matt. i. 11. 12,
† Matth. ix. 36.
‡ Matt. v. 5.
§ Luke i. 1.
‖ Luke xix. 8.
¶ Acts xiv. 23.
** Epiſt. Eliſ. Reg. Angl.
†† Diſſ. IV. § 15, &c.
‡‡ Neh. viii. 8.
§§ Diſſ. II. Part II.

The inſertion of this comment has here this additional bad conſequence, that it miſleads the reader in regard to the expoſition meant by the ſacred penman. Who would not conclude, from the verſion of Junius, that Ezra, or ſome of the Levites who attended, after reading a portion of Scripture, pronounced an explanatory diſcourſe (ſuch as in ſome Chriſtian ſocieties is called a lecture) on the paſſage. Whereas the whole import appears to be that, as the people, after the captivity, did not perfectly underſtand the ancient Hebrew, in which the Law was written, this judicious teacher found it expedient, by himſelf or others, to interpret what was read, one paragraph after another, into that dialect of Chaldee which was current among them; a practice long after continued in the ſynagogue, and not improbably, as learned men have thought, that which gave riſe to the *targums* or paraphraſes in that tongue extant to this day.

I do not remember a paſſage wherein Beza has gone quite ſo far, as Junius and Tremellius have preſumed to do in this inſtance; but that he has ſhown throughout the whole work, a manifeſt partiality to the theology then prevalent in Geneva, is beyond a doubt. I ſhall ſelect a few examples out of a much greater number, which might be brought.

§ 5. The firſt ſhall be from that celebrated diſcourſe of our Lord's, commonly called his ſermon on the mount, wherein theſe words, ηκουσατε ὁτι ἐρρέθη τοις ἀρχαιοις *, are always rendered, *Audiſtis dictum fuiſſe a veteribus*; in contradiction to all the verſions which had preceded, Oriental and Occidental, and in oppoſition to the uniform idiom of the ſacred writers. [See the note on that paſſage in this verſion.] Beza does not heſitate in his annotations to aſſign his reaſon, which is drawn not from any principle of criticiſm, not from a different reading in any ancient manuſcripts, of which he had ſeveral, but profeſſedly from the fitneſs of this verſion for ſupporting his own doctrine. "Præſtat τοις ἀρχαιοις explicare quaſi "ſcriptum ſit υπο των ἀρχαιων (*ut ſic notentur ſynagogæ* "*doctores*, jampridem ſic docentes, qui ſolebant pa-"trum et majorum nomina ſuis falſis interpretationi-"bus prætexere) quam ad auditores referre." But this correction of the ancient verſion was every way unſuitable, and the expedient weak. It was eſſential to the Phariſaical notion of traditions, to conſider them as precepts which God himſelf had given to their fathers verbally, and which were therefore called the *oral* law, in contradiſtinction to the *written* law, or the Scriptures. Conſequently Beza's repreſentation of their preſumption is far ſhort of the truth. He ought to have ſaid, *Qui ſolebant* (not *patrum et majorum nomina*, but) *Dei nomen* (for the fact is indubitable) *ſuis falſis interpretationibus prætexere.* And let it be obſerved, that our Lord does not here give any ſanction to their diſtinction of the law into *oral* and *written*. He does not once ſay, *It was ſaid to the ancients*, but uniformly, *Ye have heard that it was ſaid*. He ſpeaks not of what God did, but of what they pretended that he did.

His words, therefore, and the doctrine of the Phariſees, are alike miſrepreſented by this bold interpreter; and that for the ſake of an advantage merely imaginary againſt an adverſe ſect. The one interpretation is not more favourable to the Socinians, than the other. But if it had been otherwiſe, no perſon will conſider that as a good reaſon for miſrepreſenting, unleſs he is more ſolicitous of accommodating Scripture to his ſentiments, than of accommodating his ſentiments, to Scripture. The former has indeed been but too common with interpreters, though with few ſo much, and ſo barefacedly, as with Beza. I am ſorry to add that, in the inſtance we have been conſidering, Beza has been followed by moſt of the Proteſtant tranſlators of his day, Italian, French, and Engliſh.

§ 6. The following is another example of the ſtrong inclination which this tranſlator had, even in the ſmalleſt matters, to make his verſion conformable to his own prepoſſeſſions. He renders theſe words συν γυναιξι †, though, without either article or pronoun, *cum uxoribus*, as though the expreſſion had been συν ταις γυναιξιν αυτων. In this manner he excuſes himſelf in the notes: "Conveniebat apoſtolorum, etiam "uxores confirmari, quas vel peregrinationis illorum "comites eſſe opportebat, vel eorum abſentiam do-"mi patienter expectare." Very well: and becauſe Theodore Beza judges it to have been convenient that the Apoſtles wives, for their own confirmation, ſhould be there, he takes the liberty to make the ſacred hiſtorian ſay that they were there, when, in fact, he does not ſo much as inſinuate that there were any wives among them. The uſe of the Greek word γυνη is entirely ſimilar to that of the French word *femme*. Nobody that underſtands French would tranſlate *avec les femmes* with the wives, but with the women, whereas the proper tranſlation of *avec leurs femmes* is, with their wives.

It is impoſſible for one who knows the ſtate of the things at the time when that verſion was made, not to perceive the deſign of this miſinterpretation. The Proteſtant miniſters, amongſt whom marriage was common, were expoſed to much obloquy among the Romaniſts, through the abſurd prejudices of the latter, in favour of cellibacy. It was, therefore, deemed of great conſequence to the party, to repreſent the Apoſtles as married men. But could one imagine that

* Matth. v. 21. 27. 33.

† Acts i. 14.

that this conſideration would have weight enough to lead a man of Beza's abilities and character, into ſuch a flagrant, though not very material, miſ-tranſlation? A tranſlator ought ſurely to expreſs the full meaning of his author, as far as the language which he writes is capable of expreſſing it. But here there is an evident reſtriction of his author's meaning.

The remark of the canon of Ely is unanſwerable: "Qui mulieres dicit, uxores etiam ſub eadem appella-"tione comprehendere poteſt. At qui uxores nomi-"nat, ſolas illas nominat.---Igitur quo generalior eo "tutior erit, et Græcis convenientior interpretatio." Beſides, there may have been, for aught we know, no wives in the company, in which caſe Beza's words include a direct falſehood. And this falſhood he boldly puts into the mouth of the ſacred penman. We know that Peter had once a wife, as we learn from the Goſpel, that his wife's mother was cured by Jeſus of a fever*. But whether ſhe was living at the time referred to in the Acts, or whether any more of the Apoſtles were married, or whether their wives were diſciples, we know not. Now this falſification, though in a little matter, is ſtrongly characteriſtical of that interpreter. I am glad to add, that in this he has been deſerted by all the Proteſtant tranſlators I know.

A ſimilar inſtance the very next chapter preſents us with †. The words, ουκ εγκαταλειψεις την ψυχην μου εις αδην, he tranſlates, *Non derelinques cadaver meum in ſepulcro*, not only rendering αδης *ſepulcrum*, according to an opinion which, though ſhown above ‡, to be ill-founded, is pretty common; but ψυχη *cadaver*, carcaſe, wherein, I believe, he is ſingular. His motive is ſtill of the ſame kind. The common verſion, though unexceptionable, might be thought to ſupport the Popiſh limbo. "Quod autem annotavi ex vetere ver-"ſione *animam meam* natum eſſe errorum, ac propte-"rea me maluiſſe aliud nomen uſurpare, non temerè "feci, cùm hunc præcipue locum a Papiſtis torqueri "ad ſuum limbum conſtituendum videamus, et vete-"res etiam inde deſcenſum illum animæ Chriſti ad in-"feros excogitarint ||."

This ſpecimen from Beza, it may be thought, ſhould have been overlooked, becauſe, though inſerted in the firſt, it was corrected in the ſubſequent, editions of his verſion. This, I confeſs, was my opinion, till I obſerved, that in the annotations of thoſe very editions, he vindicates his firſt tranſlation of the words, and acknowledges that he had altered it, not from the conviction of an error, but to gratify thoſe who, without reaſon, were, through ignorance of the Latin idiom, diſſatisfied with the manner in which he had firſt rendered it. "In priore "noſtrâ editione," ſays he §, "recte interpretatus "eram, NON DERELINQUES CADAVER, &c. quod ta-"men nunc mutavi, ut iis obſequar, qui conqueſti "ſunt me a Græcis verbis diſceſſiſſe, et nomine *cada-"veris* (inſcitia certè potius Latini ſermonis quam "recto ullo judicio) offenduntur."

To Beza's reaſon for rejecting the common verſion, Caſtalio retorts, very juſtly, that if the poſſibility of wreſting a paſſage in ſupport of error, were held a good reaſon for tranſlating it otherwiſe, Beza's own verſion of the paſſage in queſtion, would be more exceptionable than what he had pretended to correct. "Deinde non minus ex ejus tranſlatione poſſit error "naſci, et quidem longe perniciosior. Cum enim "animam Chriſti vertat in cadaver, periculum eſt ne "quis animem Chriſti putet nihil fuiſſe niſi cadaver ¶." And even this opinion, which denies that Jeſus Chriſt had a human ſoul, has not been unexampled. It was maintained by Beryllus, biſhop of Boſtra in Arabia, in the third century. But, on this ſtrange principle of Beza's, where is the verſion of any part of Scripture in which we could ſafely acquieſce?

§ 7. A THIRD example of the ſame undue bias (for I reckon not the laſt, becauſe corrected, whatever was the motive) we have in his verſion of theſe words, χειροτονησαντες δε αυτοις πρεσβυτερους**, which he renders *Quumque ipſi per ſuffragia creaſſent preſbyteros*. The word χειροτονησαντες, he tranſlates from etymology, a manner which, as was obſerved before, he ſometimes uſes. χειροτονεω literally ſignifies, *to ſtretch out the hand*. From the uſe of this manner, in popular elections, it came to denote *to elect*, and thence, again, *to nominate*, or appoint any how. Now Beza, that his intention might not eſcape us, tells us in the note, "Eſt notanda vis hujus verbi, ut "Paulum ac Barnabam ſciamus nil privato arbitrio geſ-"ſiſſe, nec ullam in eccleſia exercuiſſe tyrannidem: "nil denique tale feciſſe quale hodie Romanus papa "et ipſius aſſeclæ, quos ordinarios vocant." Now, though no man is more an enemy to eccleſiaſtical tyranny than I am, I would not employ againſt it weapons borrowed from falſehood and ſophiſtry. I cannot help, therefore, declaring, that the verſion which the Vulgate has given of that paſſage, *Et quum conſtituiſſent illis preſbyteros*, fully expreſſes the ſenſe of the Greek, and conſequently that the words *per ſuffragia*, are a mere interpolation, for the ſake of anſwering a particular purpoſe. It was obſerved before ††, that uſe, where it can be diſcovered, muſt determine the ſignification in preference to etymology. And here we are at no loſs to affirm that χειροτονεω, whatever were its origin, is not confined to electing or conſtituting by a plurality of voices.

* Matth. viii. 14, 15. † Acts, ii. 27. ‡ Diſſ. VI. Part II. § 4, &c. || Bezæ Reſp. ad Caſt.
§ Bezæ Annotationes, ed. 1598. ¶ Caſt. Defen. adverſarii Errores. ** Acts, xiv. 23 †† Diſſ. IV. § 15, &c.

But whatever be in this, in the inſtance before us, the χειροτονησαντες, or electors, were no more than Paul and Barnabas; and it could not, with any propriety, be ſaid of two, that they elected by a majority of votes; ſince there can be no doubt that they muſt have both agreed in the appointment: and if it had been the diſciples, and not the two Apoſtles, who had given their ſuffrages, it would have been of the diſciples, and of them only, not of the Apoſtles, that the term χειροτονησαντες could have been uſed, which the conſtruction of the ſentence manifeſtly ſhows that here it is not. The ſenſe of the word here given by Beza, is therefore totally unexampled; for, according to him, it muſt ſignify not *to elect*, but *to conſtitute thoſe whom others have elected*. For if this be not what he means by *per ſuffragia creaſſent*, applied to no more than two, it will not be eaſy to divine his meaning, or to diſcover in what manner it anſwered the purpoſe expreſſed in his note. And if this be what he means, he has given a ſenſe to the word, for which I have not ſeen an authority from any author, ſacred or profane. The common import of the word is no more than to conſtitute, ordain, or appoint any how, by election, or otherwiſe, by one, two, or more. When it is by election, it is ſolely from the ſcope of the paſſage that we muſt collect it. In the only other place* where it occurs in the New Teſtament, it no doubt relates to a proper election. But it is from the words immediately connected, χειροτονηθεις υπο των εκκλησιων, we learn that this is the ſenſe there; as it is from the words immediately connected that we learn, with equal certainty, that it relates here to an appointment made by two perſons only.

The word occurs once in compoſition with the preposition προ. Αλλα μαρτυσι τοις προκεχειροτονημενοις υπο του Θεου †, rendered by Beza himſelf, *ſed teſtibus quos ipſe prius deſignaverat*. Here there can be no queſtion that it refers to a deſtination, of which God alone is the author, and in which, therefore, there could be no ſuffrages. For even Beza will not be hardy enough to pretend, that ſuch is the force of this verb, as to ſhow, that God did nothing but by common conſent, and only deſtined thoſe whom others had elected. That the word χειροτονεω was commonly uſed in all the latitude here aſſigned to it, Dr. Hammond has, from Philo, Joſephus, and Pagan writers of undoubted authority, given the ampleſt evidence in his Commentary.

But, ſo great was the authority of Beza with the Proteſtant tranſlators, who favoured the model of Geneva, that his expoſition of this paſſage, however ſingular, was generally adopted. Diodati ſays, ſtill more explicitly, *E dopo ch' ebbero loro ordinati* PER VOTI COMMUNI, *degli antiani*. The French, *Et apres que* PAR L'AVIS DES ASSEMBLEES, *ils eurent etabli des anciens*. The Engliſh Geneva Bible, *And when they had ordained them elders* BY ELECTION. The words in theſe verſions, diſtinguiſhed by the character, are thoſe which, after Beza's example, are interpolated. In the Engliſh tranſlation, theſe words are diſcarded. Our tranſlators did not concur in ſentiments with the Geneveſe, at leaſt in this article.

§ 8. AGAIN, that he might avoid every expreſſion which appeared to favour the doctrine of univerſal redemption, the words of the Apoſtle, concerning God, Ος παντας ανθρωπους θελει σωθηναι ‡, literally rendered in the Vulgate, *Qui omnes homines vult ſalvos fieri*, he tranſlates, *Qui quoſvis homines vult ſervari* §. A little after, in the ſame Epiſtle, Ος εστι σωτηρ παντων ανθρωπων, μαλιστα πιστων ||, in the Vulgate, *Qui eſt ſalvator omnium hominum, maxime fidelium*. Beza renders *Qui eſt conſervator omnium hominum, maximo vero fidelium*. Let it be obſerved, that this is the only place, in his verſion, where σωτηρ is rendered *conſervator*, preſerver: in every other paſſage but one, where he uſes a periphraſis, the word is *ſervator*, anſwering to *ſalvator*, in the Vulgate, *ſaviour*. If it had not been for the annexed clauſe, μαλιστα πιστων, Beza, I ſuppoſe would have retained the word *ſervator*, and had recourſe to the expedient he had uſed ſo lately for eluding the difficulty, by ſaying, *Servator quorumvis hominum*. But he perceived, that σωτηρ ανθρωπων muſt be here taken in the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe, being contradiſtinguiſhed to πιστων. I do not mean, by theſe remarks, to affirm, whether or not the word *conſervator* be equivalent to the import of the original term, as uſed in this place. It is enough for my purpoſe that, as this difference of meaning does not neceſſarily reſult, either from the words in immediate connection, or from the purport of the epiſtle, no perſon is entitled to alter the expreſſion, in order to accommodate it to his own opinions.

An

* 2 Cor. viii. 19. † Acts, x. 41. ‡ 1 Tim. ii. 4.

§ In the ſame manner he renders theſe words [Tit. ii. 11.], Επεφανη γαρ η χαρις του Θεου η σωτηριος πασιν ανθρωποις, "Illuxit enim gratia illa "Dei ſalutifera *quibuſvis* [not *omnibus*] hominibus." No modern tranſlation that I am acquainted with follows Beza in his interpretation of this verſe. The Geneva French ſays, *Car la grace de Dieu ſalutaire a tous hommes, eſt clairement apparue*. The Geneva Engliſh, *For that grace of God that bringeth ſalvaiton unto all men, hath appeared*. The tranſlators of the verſion in common uſe, have conſidered πασιν ανθρωποις as governed by επεφανη, and not by σωτηριος, rendering it, *For the grace of God that bringeth ſalvation hath appeared to all men*. Of this verſion the original is evidently capable. Diodati has done ill better in retaining the ambiguity. *Percioche e apparita la gratia di Dio ſalutare a tutti gli huomini*.

|| 1 Tim. iv. 10.

An exact counterpart to this is the manner in which an anonymous English translator has rendered these words of our Lord, Το περι πολλων εκχυνομενον εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων * *which is shed for mankind, for the remission of sins*; defending himself in a note, by observing, that "πολλοι is frequently used for ALL. Admit it were. The common acceptation of the word is doubtless *many*, and not *all*. And if no good reason for departing from the common meaning can be alleged, either from the words in construction, or from the scope of the passage, it ought to remain unchanged: otherwise, all dependence on translations, except for the theological system of the translator, is destroyed. Of the conduct of both translators, in these instances, though acting in support of opposite opinions, the error is the same. And the plea which vindicates this writer, will equally vindicate Beza, and the plea which vindicates Beza, will equally vindicate this writer. The analogy of the faith, that is, the conformity to his particular system, is the genuine plea of each.

The safest and the fairest way for a translator is, in every disputable point, to make no distinction, where the divine Spirit has not distinguished. To apply to this the words used by Boys, in a similar case, "Cur enim cautiores simus, magisque religiosi quam "Spiritus Sanctus? Si Spiritus Sanctus non dubitavit "dicere παντας et σωτηρ, cur nos vereamur dicere *omnes* "et *servator*?" In the same manner would I expostulate with certain divines amongst ourselves, who, I have observed, in quoting the preceding passages of Scripture, never say, *would have all men to be saved*, and, *the Saviour of all men*, but invariably, *all sorts of men*; charitably intending, by this prudent correction, to secure the unwary from being seduced by the latitudinarian expressions of the Apostle. If this be not being *wise above what is written*, I know not what is. In the first of the two passages quoted, I know no translator who has chosen to imitate Beza; in the second, he is followed by the Geneva French only, who says, *Le conservateur de tous hommes*. But it is proper to add, that it was not so in that version, till it had undergone a second or third revisal: for the corrections have not been all for the better.

§ 9. FURTHER, the words χαρακτηρ της υποστασεως αυτου†, rendered in the Vulgate, *figura substantiae ejus*, he has translated, *character personæ illius*. My only objection here is, to his rendering υποστασις *persona*. However much this may suit the scholastic style, which began to be introduced into theology in the fourth century, it by no means suits the idiom of a period so early as that in which the books of the New Testament were written. It is of real consequence to scriptural criticism, not to confound the language of the sacred penmen with that of the writers of the fourth, or any subsequent, century. The change in style was gradual, but in process of time became very considerable. There was scarcely a new controversy started, which did not prove the source of new terms and phrases, as well as of new or unusual applications of the old. The word υποστασις occurs four times in the New Testament, but in no other place is it rendered *person*. It occurs often in the Septuagint, but it is never the version of a Hebrew word which can be rendered *person*. Jerom, though he lived when the Sabellian and Arian controversies were fresh in the minds of men, did not discover any reason to induce him to change the word *substantia*, which he found in the former version, called the Italic. I take notice of this, principally (for I acknowledge that the expression is obscure, either way rendered) on account of the manner wherein Beza defends his version. "Quominus *substantiam* interpretarer, eo fum adduc- "tus, quod videam plerosque υποστασιν hoc loco pro "ουσια esse interpretatos, perinde ac si inter essentiam "et substantiam nihil interesset—Deinde hoc etiam "commodi habet ista interpretatio quod hypostases "adversus Sabelium aperte distinguit et το ὁμοουσιον con- "firmat adversus Arianos." Here we have a man who, in effect, acknowledges that he would not have translated some things in the way he has done, if it were not that he could thereby strike a severer blow against some adverse sect, or ward off a blow, which an adversary might aim against him. Of these great objects he never loses sight. Accordingly, the controvertist predominates throughout his whole version, as well as commentary; the translator is, in him, but a subordinate character; insomuch that he may justly be called what Jerom calls Aquila, *contentiosus interpres*.

I own, indeed, that my ideas on this subject are so much the reverse of Beza's, that I think a translator is bound to abstract from, and, as far as possible, forget, all sects and systems, together with all the polemic jargon which they have been the occasion of introducing. His aim ought to be invariably to give the untainted sentiments of the author, and to express himself in such a manner as men would do, or (which is the same thing) as those men actually did, amongst whom such disputes had never been agitated. In this last example, Beza is followed by the French and the English translators, but not by the Italian.

§ 10. AGAIN, in the some Epistle it is said, Ὁ δε δικαιος εκ πιστεως ζησεται και εαν υποστειληται, ουκ ευδοκει η ψυχη μου εν αυτω‡. In the Vulgate, rightly, *Justus autem meus ex fide vivet: quod si subtraxerit se, non placebit animæ meæ*. In Beza's version *Justus autem ex fide vivet; at*

* Matth. xxvi. 28. † Heb. i. 3. ‡ Heb. x. 38.

ſi quis ſe ſubduxerit, non eſt gratum animo meo. Here we have two errors. Firſt, the word *quis* is, to the manifeſt injury of the meaning, foiſted into the text. Yet there can be no pretence of neceſſity, as there is no ellipſis in the ſentence. By the ſyntactic order, ὁ δικαιος is underſtood as the nominative to υποστειληται; the power of the perſonal pronoun being in Greek and Latin, ſufficiently expreſſed by the inflection of the verb. Secondly, the conſequent diſpleaſure of God is tranſferred from the perſon to the action; *non eſt gratum*; as though εν αυτω could be explained otherwiſe than as referring to δικαιος. This perverſion of the ſenſe is, in my judgment, ſo groſs, as fully to vindicate from undue ſeverity, the cenſure pronounced by biſhop Pearſon *. *Illa verba a Theodoro Beza haud bonâ fide ſunt tranſlata.* But this is one of the many paſſages in which this interpreter has judged that the ſacred penmen, having expreſſed themſelves incautiouſly, and given a handle to the patrons of erroneous tenets, ſtood in need of him more as a corrector than a tranſlator. In this manner Beza ſupports the doctrine of the perſeverance of the ſaints, having been followed in the firſt of theſe errors, by the French and Engliſh tranſlators, but not in the ſecond; and not by the Italian tranſlator in either, though as much a Calviniſt as any of them. In the old Engliſh Bibles, the expreſſion was, *If he withdraw himſelf.*

§ 11. In order to evade as much as poſſible, the appearance of regard, in the diſpenſation of grace, to the diſpoſition of the receiver, the words of the Apoſtle, Τον προτερον οντα βλασφημον και διωκτην, και ὑβριστην, αλλ' ηλεηθην, ὁτι αγνοων εποιησα εν απιστια †, he renders, *qui prius eram blaſphemus et perſecutor, et injuriis alios afficiens: ſed miſericordia ſum donatus. Nam ignorans id faciebam: nempe fidei expers.* Here I obſerve, firſt, that he divides the ſentence into two, making a full ſtop at ηλεηθην, and thus diſjoins a clauſe which, in Greek, is intimately connected, and had always been ſo underſtood, as appears from all the ancient verſions and commentaries: and ſecondly, that he introduces this ſentence with *nam*, as if, in Greek, it had been γαρ, inſtead of *quia*, the proper verſion of ὁτι. Both are cauſal conjunctions; but as the former is generally employed in uniting different ſentences, and the latter in uniting the members of the ſame ſentence, the union occaſioned by the former is looſer and more indefinite than that produced by the latter. The one expreſſes a connection with the general ſcope of what was ſaid, the other with the particular clauſe immediately preceding. This ſecond ſentence, as Beza exhibits it, may be explained as an extenuation ſuggeſted by the Apoſtle, after confeſſing ſo black a crime. As if he had ſaid: "For I would "not have acted thus, but I knew not what I was "doing, as I was then an unbeliever." It is evident that the words of the original are not ſuſceptible of this interpretation. Beza has not been followed in this, either by Diodati, or by the Engliſh tranſlators. The Geneva French, and the Geneva Engliſh, have both imitated his manner.

§ 12. I SHALL produce but one other inſtance. The words of the beloved diſciple, Πας ὁ γεγεννημενος εκ του Θεου, αμαρτιαν ου ποιει ‡; rendered in the Vulgate, *Omnis qui natus eſt ex Deo, peccatum non facit*, Beza tranſlates, *Quiſquis natus eſt ex Deo, peccato non dat operam;* by this laſt phraſe, endeavouring to elude the ſupport which the original appears to give to the doctrine of the ſinleſs perfection of the ſaints in the preſent life. That this was his view, is evident from what he had urged in defence of the phraſe, in his annotations on the fourth verſe, to which he has ſubjoined theſe words: "Itaque non homines ſed monſtra hominum "(ſuch was his polemic ſtyle) ſunt Pelagiani, Cathari, "Cœleſtiani, Donatiſtæ, Anabaptiſtæ, Libertini, qui "ex hoc loco perfectionem illam ſomniant, a qua ab- "ſunt ipſi omnium hominum longiſſime." His only argument, worthy of notice, is the ſeeming inconſiſtency of this verſe, with what the Apoſtle had advanced a little before, Εαν ειπωμεν ὁτι αμαρτιαν ουκ εχομεν, ἑαυτους πλανωμεν §, *If we ſay that we have no ſin, we deceive ourſelves.* But he has not conſidered, that if one of thoſe human monſters (as he meekly calls them) ſhould render this verſe, *If we ſay that we have never ſinned* (which is not a greater ſtretch than he has made in rendering the other), the reconciliation of the two paſſages is equally well effected as by his method. But as, in fact, neither of theſe expedients can be vindicated, the only fair way is, to exhibit both verſes in as general terms as the inſpired penman has left them in; and thus to put, as nearly as poſſible, the readers of the tranſlation on the ſame footing on which the ſacred writers have put the readers of the original.

There is ſtill another reaſon which ſeems to have influenced Beza in rendering αμαρτιαν ποιει *peccato dat operam*, which is kindly to favour ſinners, not exorbitantly profligate, ſo far as to diſpel all fear about their admiſſion into the kingdom of heaven. This conſtruction may be thought uncharitable. I own I ſhould have thought ſo myſelf, if he had not explicitly ſhown his principles, on this ſubject, in other places. That expreſſion, in the ſermon on the mount, Αποχωρειτε απ' εμου οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν ||, he renders

Abſcedite

* See his Præfatio Paræneticа, prefixed to Grabe's Septuagint.
† Tim. i. 13. ‡ 1. John, iii. 9. § 1 John, i. 8. || Matth. vii. 23.

Abſcedite a me qui operam datis iniquitati. And though he is ſingular in uſing this phraſe, I ſhould not, even from it, have concluded ſo harſhly of his motive, if his explanation in the note had not put it beyond doubt. Οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν, "id eſt, OMNIBUS "ſceleribus et flagitiis addicti homines—qui velut ar- "tem peccandi exercent, ſicut Latini medicinam, ar- "genteriam facere dicunt." Thus, if he wound the ſenſe in the verſion, he kills it outright in the commentary. In another edition, wherein he renders the text ſimply *facitis iniquitatem*, he ſays, ſtill more expreſsly, "Dicuntur ergo *facere iniquitatem*, et a "Chriſto rejiciuntur hoc in loco, non qui *uno et altero* "ſcelere ſunt contaminati, ſed qui hanc velut artem "faciunt, ut ſceleſte agendo vitam tolerent, et Dei "nomine abutantur ad quæſtum, quo cupiditatibus "ſuis ſatisfaciant." Caſtalio, after quoting theſe words, ſays *, very juſtly, and even moderately, "Hæc ſunt ejus [Bezæ] verba, quibus mihi videtur "(ſi modo de habitu loquitur, ſicut antitheſis oſten- "dere videtur) nimis latam ſalutis viam facere': quaſi "Chriſtus non rejiciat ſceleratos, ſed duntaxat ſce- "leratiſſimos. Enimvero longe aliter loquuntur ſa- "cræ literæ."

Not only Scripture in general, he might have ſaid, but that diſcourſe in particular, on which Beza was then commenting, ſpeaks a very different language: *Except your righteouſneſs*, ſays Jeſus †, *ſhall exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall in no caſe enter into the kingdom of heaven.* It would have better ſuited Beza's ſyſtem of Chriſtian morality, to ſaid, *Except your unrighteouſneſs ſhall exceed the unrighteouſneſs of publicans and harlots, ye ſhall in no caſe be excluded from the kingdom of heaven.* But as our Lord's declaration was the reverſe, it is worth while to obſerve in what manner this champion of Geneva eludes its force, and reconciles it to his own licentious maxims. Hear his note upon the place: "Juſtitiæ no- "mine intellige ſinceram tum doctrinam tum vitam, "cum verbo Dei videlicet, quod eſt juſtitiæ vera "norma, congruentum. Sed, de doctrina potiſſi- "mum hic agi liquet ex ſequenti reprehenſione falſa- "rum legis interpretationum." And on the laſt clauſe of the ſentence, *nequaquam ingreſſuros in regnum cælorum*, he ſays, "Id eſt, indignos fore qui in "eccleſia doceatis. Nec enim de quorumvis piorum "officio, ſed de ſolis doctoribus agit: et nomine regni "cœlorum, ut alibi ſæpe, non triumphantem (ut vul- "go loquuntur), ſed adhuc militantem, et miniſterio paſtorum egentem eccleſiam intelligit."

According to this learned commentator, then, *your righteouſneſs* here means, chiefly or ſolely, *your orthodoxy*; I ſay *chiefly* or *ſolely*: for obſerve his artful climax, in ſpeaking of teachers and teaching. When firſt he obtrudes the word *doctrine*, in explanation of the word *righteouſneſs*, he puts it only on the level with a good life; it is "tum doctrinam tum vitam." When mentioned the ſecond time, a good life is dropt, becauſe, as he affirms, "de doctrina potiſſimum hic "agi liquet." When the ſubject is again aſſumed, in explaining the latter part of the ſentence, every thing which relates to life and practice is excluded from a ſhare in what is ſaid; for after this gradual preparation of his readers, they are plainly told, "de ſolis "doctoribus hic agit." Now, every body knows, that Beza meant by orthodoxy, or ſound doctrine, an exact conformity to the Geneveſe ſtandard. The import of our Lord's declaration, then, according to this bold expoſitor, amounts to no more than this, 'If ye be not completely orthodox, ye ſhall not be 'teachers in the church.' In this way of expounding the Scripture, what purpoſes may it not be made to ſerve? For my part, I have ſeen nothing, in any commentator or caſuiſt, which bears a ſtronger reſemblance to that mode of ſubverting, under pretence of explaining, the divine law, which was adopted by the Scribes, and ſo ſevere reprehended by our Lord. In the paſſage taken from John's Epiſtle, I do not find that Beza has had any imitators. In the verſion of the like phraſe in the Goſpel, he has been followed by the Geneva French, which ſays, *Vous qui faites le métier d'iniquitié.*

§ 13. I MIGHT collect many more paſſages, but I ſuppoſe that thoſe which have been given, will ſufficiently verify what has been advanced of this tranſlator's partiality. Any one who critically examines his tranſlation, will ſee how much he ſtrains in every page, eſpecially in Paul's Epiſtles, to find a place for the favourite terms and phraſes of his party. A French projector, Monſieur le Cene (whoſe project for a new tranſlation was, in what regards one article, conſidered already), ſeems, though of a party in many things oppoſite to Beza's, to have entertained certain looſe notions of tranſlating, which in general coincide with his; but by reaſon of their different parties, would have produced, in the application, contrary effects. As a contraſt to Beza's corrections of the unguarded ſtyle (as he certainly thought it) of the ſacred penmen, I ſhall give a few of Le Cene's corrections, which he propoſed, with the ſame pious purpoſe of ſecuring the unlearned reader againſt ſeduction ‡. The words of the Apoſtle, rendered by Beza, *Qui credit in eum qui juſtificat impium* §, Le Cene

* Caſ. Defenſ. Adverſarii Errores. † Matth. v. 20. ‡ Proj. &c. ch. xiv. § Rom. iv, 16.

Cene thus tranſlates into French: *Que croit en celui qui juſtifie* CELUI QUI AVOIT ETE *un impie.* The expreſſion rendered by Beza, *Quem autem vult indurat* *, Le Cene thinks ought to be corrected; and though he does not, in ſo many words, ſay how; it is plain, from the tenor of his remark, that he would have it *permittit ut ſeipſum induret.* He adds, "It behoveth "alſo to reform (I uſe his own ſtyle, *Il faudroit auſſi "reformer*) what the Vulgate and Geneveſe verſions (he might have added, Moſes and Paul) repreſent God as ſaying to Pharaoh, *In hoc ipſum excitavi te, ut oſtendam in te virtutem meam* †; but does not mention the reformation neceſſary.

I cannot help obſerving here, by the way, that though Caſtalio was, in regard to the ſubject of the chapter from which ſome of the foregoing quotations are taken, of ſentiments, as appears from his notes, oppoſite to Beza's, and coincident with Le Cene's, he has tranſlated the whole with the utmoſt fairneſs. Nor has he employed any of thoſe gloſſing arts recommended by Le Cene, and ſo much practiſed by Beza, when encountering a paſſage that appeared favourable to an adverſary. Merely from his tranſlation, we ſhould not diſcover that his opinions of the divine decrees, and the freedom of human actions differed from Beza's. If both interpreters, however, have ſometimes failed in their repreſentations of the ſacred authors, the difference between them lies in this: the liberties which Caſtalio has taken, are almoſt ſolely in what regards their ſtyle and manner; the freedoms uſed by Beza affect their ſentiments and doctrine.

But to return to Le Cene, of whom I ſhall give but one other ſpecimen; the words rendered by Beza, *Quia iterum dixit Eſaias, Excæcavit oculus eorum et obduravit cor eorum; ne videant occulis, et ſint intelligentes corde, et ſeſe convertant et Sanem eos* ‡; he propoſes in this manner to expreſs in French: *Ce qui avoit fait dire a Iſaie; ils ont aveuglés leurs yeux et endurici leur cœur, pour ne pas voir de leur yeux, et pour n'entendre point du cœur, et de peur de ſe convertir, et d'être gueris.* "They have blinded their eyes, and "hardened their heart," &c. inſtead of, "He hath "blinded, &c." Surely, the difference between theſe interpretations, regards more the ſenſe than the expreſſion. In the latter inſtances, we have the Arminian uſing the ſame weapons againſt the Calviniſt, which in the former, we ſaw the Calviniſt employ againſt the Arminian; a conduct alike unjuſtifiable in both.

§ 14. THESE examples may ſuffice to ſhow that, if tranſlators ſhall think themſelves entitled, with Beza and Le Cene, and the anonymous Engliſh tranſlator above quoted, to uſe ſuch liberties with the original, in order to make it ſpeak their own ſentiments, or the ſentiments of the party to which they have attached themſelves, we ſhall ſoon have as many Bibles as we have ſects, each adapted to ſupport a different ſyſtem of doctrine and morality; a Calviniſtic Bible, and an Arminian, an Antinomian Bible, a Pelagian, and I know not how many more. Hitherto, notwithſtanding our diſputes, we have recurred to a common ſtandard; and this circumſtance, however lightly it may be thought of, has not been without its utility, eſpecially in countries where the Chriſtian principle of toleration is underſtood and practiſed. It has abated the violence of all ſides, inſpiring men with candour and moderation in judging of one another, and of the importance of the tenets which diſcriminate them. The reverſe would take place, if every faction had a ſtandard of its own, ſo prepared, as to be clearly deciſive in ſupporting all its favourite dogmas, and in condemning thoſe of every other faction. It may be ſaid, that the original would ſtill be a ſort of common ſtandard, whoſe authority would be acknowledged by them all. It no doubt would: but when we conſider how ſmall a proportion of the people, of any party, are qualified to read the original, and how much it would be the buſineſs of the leading partizans, in every ſect, to preoccupy the minds of the people, in regard to the fidelity of their own verſion, and the partiality of every other, we cannot imagine that the poſſeſſion of a ſtandard, to which hardly one in a thouſand could have recourſe, would have a ſenſible effect upon the party. Of ſo much conſequence it is, in a tranſlator, to baniſh all party-conſiderations, to forget, as far as poſſible, that he is connected with any party; and to be ever on his guard, leſt the ſpirit of the ſect abſorb the ſpirit of the Chriſtian, and he appear to be more the follower of ſome human teacher, a Calvin, an Arminius, a Socinus, a Pelagius, an Arius, or an Athanaſius, than of our only divine and rightful teacher, Chriſt.

§ 15. SOME allowance is no doubt to be made for the influence of polemic theology, the epidemic diſeaſe of thoſe times wherein moſt of the verſions, which I have been examining, were compoſed. The imaginations of men were heated, and their ſpirits embittered with continual wranglings, not eaſily avoidable in their circumſtances: and thoſe who were daily accuſtomed to ſtrain every expreſſion of the ſacred writers, in their debates one with another, were ſurely not the fitteſt for examining them with that temper and coolneſs, which are neceſſary in perſons who

* Rom. ix. 18. † Rom. ix. 17. Exod. ix. 16. ‡ John xii. 39, 40.

who would approve themſelves unbiaſſed tranſlators. Beſides, criticiſm, eſpecially ſacred criticiſm, was then but in its infancy. Many improvements, through the united labours of the learned in different parts of Europe, have ſince accrued to that ſcience. Much of our ſcholaſtic controverſy on abſtruſe and undeterminable queſtions, well characteriſed by the Apoſtle, *ſtrifes of words, which miniſter not to godly edifying* *, are now happily laid aſide. It may be hoped, that ſome of the blunders into which the rage of diſputation has formerly betrayed interpreters, may, with proper care, be avoided; and that the dotage about queſtions, which gender contention (queſtions than which nothing can be more hollow or unſound †), being over, ſome will dare to ſpeak, and others bear to hear, the things which become ſound doctrine, the doctrine according to godlineſs.

* 1 Tim. vi. 3, &c. † See an excellent ſermon on this ſubject, by my learned colleague, Dr. Gerard, vol. II. p. 129.

DISSERTATION

DISSERTATION THE ELEVENTH.

Of the Regard which, in tranſlating Scripture into Engliſh, is due to the Practice of former Tranſlators, particularly of the Authors of the Latin Vulgate, and of the common Engliſh Tranſlation.

PART I.

The Regard due to the Vulgate.

IN the former Diſſertation *, I took occaſion to conſider what are the chief things to be attended to by every tranſlator, but more eſpecially a tranſlator of holy writ. They appeared to be the three following; firſt, to give a juſt and clear repreſentation of the ſenſe of his original; ſecondly, to convey into his verſion as much of his author's ſpirit and manner as the genius of the language, which he writes, will admit; thirdly, as far as may be in a conſiſtency with the two other ends, to expreſs himſelf with purity in the language of the verſion. If theſe be the principal objects, as, in my opinion, they are; they will ſupply us with a good rule for determining the preciſe degree of regard which is due to former tranſlators of reputation, whoſe works may have had influence ſufficient to give a currency to the terms and phraſes they have adopted. When the terms and phraſes employed by former interpreters are well adapted for conveying the ſenſe of the author, when they are alſo ſuited to his manner, and do no ſuch violence to the idiom of the language into which they are transferred, as is incompatible with propriety and perſpicuity, they are juſtly preferred to other words equally expreſſive and proper, but which, not having been uſed by former interpreters of name, are not current in that application. This, in my opinion, is the furtheſt we can go, without making greater account of tranſlations than of the original, and ſhowing more reſpect to the words and idioms of fallible men, than to the inſtructions given by the unerring Spirit of God.

§ 2. IF in reſpect of any of the three ends above mentioned, former tranſlators, on the moſt impartial examination, appear to have failed, ſhall we either copy or imitate their errors? When the queſtion is thus put in plain terms, I do not know any critic that is hardy enough to anſwer in the affirmative. But we no ſooner deſcend to particulars, than we find that thoſe very perſons who gave us reaſon to believe that they agree with us in the general principles, ſo totally differ in the application, as to ſhow themſelves diſpoſed to ſacrifice all thoſe primary objects in tranſlating to the phraſeology of a favourite tranſlator. Even Father Simon could admit that *it would be wrong to imitate the faults of Saint Jerom, and to pay greater deference to his authority than to the truth* †. How far the verdicts he has pronounced on particular paſſages in the ſeveral verſions criticiſed by him, are conſiſtent with this judgment, ſhall be ſhown in the ſequel.

§ 3. BUT, before I proceed farther, it may not be amiſs to make ſome remarks on what appears to have been

* X. Part I.

† En effet, il [Pagnin] auroit eu tort d'imiter les fautes de St. Jerôme, et de deferer plus à l'autorité, de ce pere, qu' à la verité Hiſt. Crit. du Vieux Teſtament, liv. II. ch. xx.

been Simon's great ſcope and deſign in the Critical Hiſtory; for, in the examination of certain points ſtrenuouſly maintained by him, I ſhall chiefly be employed in this Diſſertation. His opinions in what regards biblical criticiſm, have long had great influence on the judgment of the learned, both Popiſh and Proteſtant. His profound erudition in Oriental matters, joined with uncommon penetration, and, I may add, ſtrong appearances of moderation, have procured him, on this ſubject, a kind of ſuperiority, which is hardly diſputed by any. Indeed, if I had not read the anſwers made to thoſe who attacked his work, which are ſubjoined to his Critical Hiſtory, and commonly, if I miſtake not, thought to be his, though bearing different names, I ſhould not have ſpoken ſo dubiouſly of his title to the virtue of moderation. But throughout theſe tracts, I acknowledge, there reigns much of the illiberal ſpirit of the controvertiſt. None of the little arts, however foreign to the ſubject in debate, by which contempt and odium are throw upon an adverſary, are omitted. And, we may ſay with truth, that by aſſuming too too high an aſcendant over Le Clerc and his other antagoniſts, he has degraded himſelf below them, farther, I believe, than, by any other method, he could have ſo eaſily effected.

§ 4. In regard to Simon's principal work, which I have ſo often had occaſion to mention, *the Critical Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtaments*, its merit is ſo well known and eſtabliſhed in the learned world, as to render it ſuperfluous now to attempt its character. I ſhall only animadvert a little on what appears to me, after repeated peruſals, to be the chief objects of the author, and on his manner of purſuing theſe objects. It will ſcarcely admit a doubt, that his primary ſcope, throughout the whole performance, is to repreſent Scripture as, in every thing of moment, either unintelligible or ambiguous. His view in this is ſufficiently glaring; it is to convince his readers that, without the aid of tradition, whereof the church is both the depoſitary and the interpreter, no one article of Chriſtianity, with evidence ſufficient to ſatisfy a rational inquirer, can be deduced from Scripture. A ſecond aim, but in ſubordination to the former, is to bring his readers to ſuch an acquieſcence in the Latin Vulgate, which he calls the tranſlation of the church, as to conſider the deviations from it in modern verſions, from whatever cauſe they ſpring, attention to the meaning, or to the letter, of the original, as erroneous and indefenſible.

The manner in which the firſt of theſe aims has been purſued by him, I took occaſion to conſider in a former Diſſertation*, to which I muſt refer my reader; I intend now to inquire a little into the methods by which he ſupports this ſecondary aim, the faithfulneſs of the Vulgate, and, if not its abſolute perfection, its ſuperiority, at leaſt to every other attempt that has been made, in the Weſtern churches, towards tranſlating the Bible. This inquiry naturally falls in with the firſt part of my ſubject in the preſent Diſſertation, in which I hope to ſhow, to the ſatisfaction of the reader, that Mr. Simon might, with equal plauſibility, have maintained the ſuperiority of that verſion over every tranſlation which ever ſhall, or can, be made of holy writ.

§ 5. From the view which I have given of his deſign with reſpect to the Vulgate, one would naturally expect, that he muſt rate very highly the verdict of the council of Trent in favour of that verſion, that he muſt derive its excellence, as others of his order have done, from immediate inſpiration, and conclude it to be infallible. Had this been his method of proceeding his book would have excited little attention from the beginning, except from thoſe whoſe minds were pre-engaged on the ſame ſide by bigotry or intereſt, and would probably, long ere now, have been forgotten. What perſon of common ſenſe in theſe days ever thinks of the ravings of Harduin the Jeſuit, who, in oppoſition to antiquity and all the world, maintained, that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts wrote in Latin, that the Vulgate was the original, and the Greek New Teſtament a verſion, and that conſequently the latter ought to be corrected by the former, not the former by the latter, with many other abſurdities, to which Michaelis has done too much honour, in attempting to refute them in his lectures?

But Simon's method was, in fact, the reverſe. The ſentence of the council, as was hinted formerly, he has explained in ſuch a manner as to denote no more than would be readily admitted by every moderate and judicious Proteſtant. The inſpiration of the tranſlator he diſclaims, and conſequently the infallibility of the verſion. He aſcribes no ſuperiority to it above the original. This ſuperiority was but too plainly implied in the indecent compariſon which Cardinal Ximenes made of the Vulgate as printed in his edition (the Complutenſian) between the Hebrew and the Septuagint, to our Lord crucified between two thieves, making the Hebrew repreſent the hardened thief and the Greek the penitent. Simon, on the contrary, ſhews no diſpoſition to detract from the merit either of the original, or of any ancient verſion; though not inclinable to allow more to the editions and

* Diſſ. III. § 1—17.

ſcripts we are at preſent poſſeſſed of, than the principles of ſound criticiſm appear to warrant. He admits that we have yet no perfect verſion of holy writ, and does not deny that a better may be made than any extant *. In ſhort, nothing can be more equitable than the general maxims he eſtabliſhes. It is by this method that he inſenſibly gains upon his readers, inſinuates himſelf into their good graces, and brings them, before they are aware, to repoſe an implicit confidence in his discernment, and to admit, without examining, the equity of his particular deciſions. Now all theſe deciſions are made artfully to conduct them to one point which he is the ſurer to carry, as he never openly propoſes it, namely, to conſider the Vulgate as the ſtandard, by a conformity to which, the value of every other verſion ought to be eſtimated.

§ 6. In conſequence of this ſettled purpoſe, not declared in words, but, without difficulty, diſcovered by an attentive reader, he finds every other verſion which he examines, either too literal or too looſe, in rendering almoſt every paſſage which he ſpecifies, according as it is more or leſs ſo, than that which he has tacitly made to ſerve as the common meaſure for them all. And though it is manifeſt, that even the moſt literal are not more blameably literal in any place than the Vulgate is in other places; or even the moſt looſe tranſlations more wide of the ſenſe than in ſome inſtances that verſion may be ſhown to be; he has always the addreſs to bring his readers (at leaſt on their firſt reading his book) to believe with him, that the exceſs, of whatever kind it be, is in the other verſions, and not in the Vulgate. In order to this he is often obliged to argue from contrary topics, and at one time to defend a mode of interpreting which he condemns at another. And though this inevitably involves him in contradictions, theſe, on a ſingle, or even a ſecond or third peruſal, are apt to be overlooked by a reader who is not uncommonly attentive. The inconſiſtencies elude the reader's notice the more readily, as they are not brought under his view at once, but muſt be gathered from parts of the work not immediately connected; and, as the individual paſſages in queſtion are always different, though the manner in which they are tranſlated, and on which the criticiſm turns, is the ſame. Add to this, that our critic's mode of arguing is the more ſpecious and unſuſpected, becauſe it is remarkably ſimple and diſpaſſionate. It will be neceſſary, therefore, though it may be accounted a bold and even invidious undertaking, to re-examine a few of the paſſages examined by Father Simon, that we may, if poſſible, diſcover whether there be reaſon for the charge of partiality and inconſiſtency, which has been juſt now brought againſt him.

§ 7. In his examination of Eraſmus's verſion of the New Teſtament, he has the following obſervation: "Where we have in the Greek τυ ὁρισθεντος υιυ θευ "εν δυναμει †, the ancient Latin interpreter has very "well and literally rendered it, *qui prædeſtinatus eſt* "*filius Dei in virtute*, which was alſo the verſion "uſed in the Weſtern churches before Saint Jerom, "who has made no change on this place. I do not "inquire whether that interpreter has read προορισθεντος as ſome believe: for *prædeſtinatus* ſignifies no "more here than *deſtinatus*: and one might put in "the tranſlation *prædeſtinatus*, who read ὁρισθεντος, "as we read at preſent in all the Greek copies; "and there is nothing here that concerns what theo"logians commonly call *predeſtination*. Eraſmus, "however, has forſaken the ancient verſion, and ſaid, "*qui declaratus fuit filius Dei cum potentia*. It is true, "that many learned Greek fathers have explained "the Greek participle ὁρισθεντες by δειχθεντες, αποφαν"θεντες; that is, *demonſtrated* or *declared*: but an ex"planation is not a tranſlation. One may remark, "in a note, that that is the ſenſe which Saint Chry"ſoſtom has given the paſſage, without changing "the ancient verſion, as it very well expreſſes the "energy of the Greek word, which ſignifies rather "*deſtinatus* and *definitus* than *declaratus* ‡". Thus far Simon.

Admit that the Vulgate is here literal, ſince this critic is pleaſed to call it ſo; it is at the ſame time obſcure, if not unmeaning. What the import of the word *predeſtinated* may be when, as he ſays, it has no relation to what divines call *predeſtination*, and conſequently cannot be ſynonymous with *predetermined*,

* Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. III. ch. i.

† Rom. i. 2.

‡ Où il y a dans le Grec, τυ ὁρισθεντος υιυ θευ εν δυναμει, l'ancien interprete Latin a fort bien traduit à la lettre, *qui prædeſtinatus eſt filius Dei in virtute*; et c'eſt même la verſion qui étoit en uſage dans les egliſes d'Occident avant Saint Jerome, qui n'y a rein changé en cet endroit. Je n'examine point ſi cet interprete a lû προορισθεντος, comme quelques uns le croyent: car *prædeſtinatus* ne ſignifie en ce lieu-là que *deſtinatus*; et ainſi l'on a pû traduire *prædeſtinatus* en liſant ὁρισθεντος, comme on lit preſentement dans tous les exemplaires Grecs, et il ne s'agit nullement de ce que les theologiens appliquent ordinairment *predeſtination*. Eraſme cependant s'eſt éloigné de cette ancienne verſion, ayant traduit *qui declaratus fuit filius Dei cum potentia*. Il eſt vrai que pluſieurs doctes peres Grecs ont expliqué le verbe Grec ὁριζεσθαι par δι χωτος αποφαινεσθαι. c'eſt-à-dire demontré ou declaré: mais une explication n'eſt pas une traduction. L'on peut marquer dans une note que c'eſt là le ſens que Saint Chryſoſtome a donné à ce paſſage, ſans changer pour cela la verſion ancienne, qui exprime trés-bien la force du mot Grec qui ſignifie plûtôt *deſtinatus*, *definitus* que *declaratus*. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxii.

mined, foreordained, he has not been ſo kind as to tell us; and it will not be in every body's power to gueſs. For my part, I do not comprehend that curious aphoriſm as here applied, *An explanation is not a tranſlation.* Tranſlation is undoubtedly one ſpecies, and that both the ſimpleſt and the moſt important ſpecies, of explanation: and when a word is found in one language, which exactly hits the ſenſe of a word in another language as uſed in a particular paſſage, though it ſhould not reach the meaning in other places, it is certainly both the proper tranſlation, and the beſt explanation, of the word in that paſſage.

And, for the truth of this ſentiment, I am happy to have it in my power to add, that I have the concurrence of Mr. Simon himſelf moſt explicitly declared. Speaking of a Spaniſh tranſlation of the Old Teſtament by a Portugueſe Jew, which is very literal, as all Jewiſh tranſlations are, he ſays *, "This gram- "matical rigour does not often ſuit the ſenſe. We "muſt diſtinguiſh between a dictionary and a tranſla- "tion. In the former, one explains the words ac- "cording to their proper ſignification, whereas, in "the latter, it is ſometimes neceſſary to divert them "from their proper and primitive ſignification, in or- "der to adjuſt them to the other words with which "they are connected." In another place †, "He "[*Pagnin*] has imagined that, in order to make a "faithful tranſlation of Scripture, it was neceſſary "to follow the letter exactly, and according to the "rigour of grammar; a practice quite oppoſite to "that pretended exactneſs; becauſe it rarely happens "that two languages agree in their idioms; and thus, "ſo far from expreſſing his original in the ſame pu- "rity wherein it is written, he diſfigures it, and "ſpoils it of all its ornaments." In the former of theſe quotations, the author ſhows that the literal method is totally unfit for conveying an author's ſenſe, and therefore ill ſuited for anſwering the firſt great end in tranſlating; and in the latter, that it is no better adapted either for doing juſtice to an author's manner, or for producing a work which can be uſeful or agreeable, and therefore equally unfit for all the primary purpoſes of tranſlating. Had it been this author's declared intention to refute his own criticiſm on the paſſage quoted from Eraſmus, he could have ſaid nothing ſtronger or more pertinent.

I ſhall juſt add to his manner of reaſoning on this ſubject, a particular example, which may ſerve as a counterpart to the remark on Eraſmus above quoted. Speaking of the tranſlators of Port Royal, he ſays ‡, "They have followed the grammatical ſenſe of the "Greek text in tranſlating John, xvi. 13. *Il vous "fera entrer dans toutes les vertés*, as if this other ſenſe, "which is in the Vulgate, and which they have put "into their note, *il vous enſeignera toute verité*, did "not anſwer exactly to the Greek. But John Bois "has not thought the new tranſlators worthy of ap- "probation for changing *docebit*, which is, in our "Latin edition, into another word. *Vetus*, ſays this "learned Proteſtant, *docebit, non male nam et ὁδηγεῖ "ſuo modo ὁδηγεῖ et ὁ ὁδηγῶν ſuo modo διδασκει.*" Yet let it be obſerved, that here it is the new interpreters, and not the Vulgate, who very well expreſs the energy of the Greek word, and that without either deſerting the meaning, or darkening it, as the Vulgate, in the former caſe, has not ſcrupled to do. Here he has given, indeed, the moſt ample ſcope for retorting upon the Vulgate, in his own words, that ὁδηγεῖ may indeed be explained by *docebit*, "but an explanation "is not a tranſlation.

§ 8. But this is not all. Our critic objects alſo to the freedom which Eraſmus has taken in tranſlating the Greek prepoſition ἐν in the forecited paſſage by the Latin *cum*. "Beſides," ſays he §," although "the "Greek particle ἐν ſignifies, in the ſtyle of the writers "of the New Teſtament, which is conformable to "to that of the Seventy *in* and *cum*, it had been bet- "ter to tranſlate, as it is in the Vulgate, *in virtute*, or "*in potentia*, and to write on the margin that *in* ſig- "nifies alſo *cum*, becauſe there is but one ſingle prepo- "ſition which anſwers to them both in the Hebrew "or Chaldaic language, with which the Greek of "the New Teſtament often agrees, eſpecially in this "ſort of prepoſitions."

Now it is very remarkable, that there is nothing

* Cette rigeur de grammaire ne s'accorde pas ſouvent avec le ſens. Il faut mettre de la difference entre un dictionaire et une traduction. Dans le premier on explique les mots ſelon leur ſignification propre, au-lieu que dans l'autre il eſt quelquefois neceſſaire de detourner les mots de leur ſignifications propres et primitives, pour les ajuſter aux autres mots avec leſquels ils ſont joints. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xix.

† Il s'eſt imaginé que pour faire une traduction fidelle de l'Ecriture, il etoit neceſſaire de ſuivre la lettre exactement et ſelon la rigeur de la grammaire; ce qui eſt tout-a-fait oppoſé à cette prétendue exactitude, parce qu'il eſt rare que deux langues ſe rencontrent dans leurs façons de parler: et ainſi, bien loin d'exprimer ſon original dans la même pureté qu'il eſt ecrit, il le défigure, et le depouille de tous ſes ornemens. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch xx.

‡ Ils ont ſuivi le ſens grammatical du texte Grec en traduiſant, *il vous fera entrer*, &c. comme ſi cet autre ſens qui eſt dans la Vulgate, et qu'ils ont mit dans leur none, *il vous enſeignera*, &c. ne repondoit pas exactement au Grec. Mais Jean Boys n'a pû approuver les nouveaux traducteurs, qui ont changé *docebit*, qui eſt dans nôtre edition Latine en un autre mot. *Vetus*, &c. Hiſt. Crit. de Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxvi.

§ De plus, bien que la particule Grecque ἐν ſignifie dans le ſtile des ecrivains du Nouveau Teſtament qui eſt conforme à celui des Septante, *in* et *cum*, il eût été mieux de traduire, comme il y a dans la Vulgate *in virtute* ou *in potentia*, et de mettre à la marge que *in* ſignifie auſſi *cum*; parce qu'il n'y a qu'une ſeule prepoſition qui réponde à ces deux-la dans la langue Ebraique ou Caldaique, a laquelle le Grec du N. T. eſt ſouvent conforme, ſur-tout dans ces ſortes de prepoſitions. N. T. I. II. c. xxii

which he treats as more contemptible and even abſurd in Arias Montanus, than that very attempt at uniformity, in tranſlating the Hebrew prepoſitions and other particles. "Can one," ſays he*, "give the title "of a very exact interpreter, to a tranſlator, who "almoſt everywhere confounds the ſenſe of his text? "In effect, all his erudition conſiſts in tranſlating the "Hebrew words literally, according to their moſt "ordinary ſignification, without minding whether it "agree, or not, with the context where he employs "it. When the Hebrew words are equivocal, one "ought, methinks, to have ſome regard to that ſig-"nification which ſuits them in the places where "they are found; and it is ridiculous to aſſign them "indifferently every ſort of ſignification ſuitable or "unſuitable. Yet this fault abounds in every part "of the verſion of Arias Montanus, who has herein "diſplayed very little judgment. He has, for ex-"ample, tranſlated, in almoſt every paſſage, the "Hebrew prepoſition *al* by the Latin *ſuper*; whereas "it is well known that this prepoſition ſignifies in "Hebrew, ſometimes *ſuper*, ſometimes *juxta*, ſome-"times *cum*. He has done the ſame in regard to the "letter *lamed*, which anſwers to the French *pour*, "where it is a mark of the dative. Thus the words of "Geneſis, which Pagnin had rendered clearly enough, "*Dividat aquas ab aquis*, he has tranſlated, without "any meaning, *Dividat aquas ad aquas*.

Here in two parallel caſes, for the queſtion is the ſame in both, whether the ſenſe or the letter merit moſt the attention of the tranſlator, or more particularly, whether or not the prepoſitions of the original ought uniformly to be tranſlated in the ſame way, without regard to the ſenſe, our learned critic has pronounced two ſentences perfectly oppoſite to each other. This oppoſition is the more flagrant, as Arias had actually taken the method which Simon inſiſts that Eraſmus ought to have taken. He followed the letter in the text, and gave the meaning, by way of comment, on the margin. The ſecond deciſion, however, we may reaſonably conclude, is the deciſion of his judgment, as neither of the interpreters compared, Pagnin nor Arias, is a favourite with him; whereas the firſt is the deciſion merely of his affection, as Eraſmus was oppoſed to the Vulgate.

§ 9. In further confirmation of the judgment I have juſt now given, it may be obſerved that in every caſe wherein the Vulgate is not concerned, his verdict is uniform in preferring the ſenſe to the letter. "There is," ſays he†, "in this laſt reviſal of the verſion of "Geneva, *Alors on commença d'appeller du nom del'Eter-"nel*, which yields an obſcure and even abſurd mean-"ing. It is indeed true that Aquila has tranſlated "word for word after the ſame manner; but he has "followed literally the grammatical ſenſe. Now, "with the aid of a very ſlight acquaintance with He-"brew, one might know that this phraſe *appeller du "nom* ſignifies to invoke the name, eſpecially when "the diſcourſe is of God." In like manner, when the Vulgate is concerned in the queſtion, and happens to follow the ſenſe in an inſtance wherein the verſion compared with it prefers the letter, we may be certain that our author's deciſion is then for the ſenſe. "The Seventy," he tells us‡, "have rendered Επικαταρατος "συ απο παντων των κτηνων, where we have in the Vul-"gate, *maledictus es inter omnia animantia*: the Greek "word απο uſed by the Septuagint in this place, is "unſuitable and nonſenſical." Such is the ſentence which our author invariably pronounces on this truly ſenſeleſs mode of tranſlating.

But ſtill it is with a ſecet exception of all the inſtances wherein this ſenſeleſs mode of tranſlating has been adopted by the Vulgate. For this adoption has inſtantly converted it into the only proper method, and the verſion which the plain ſenſe of the paſſage indicates, muſt then be conſigned to the margin; for *an explanation is not a tranſlation*.

§ 10. To the preceding remarks, I ſhall ſubjoin two

* Peut on donner la qualité d'interprete très-exact à un traducteur qui renverſe preſque par tout le ſens de ſon texte? En effet, toute ſon erudition conſiſte à traduire les mots Hebreux à la lettre, ſelon leur ſignification la plus ordanaire, ſans prendre garde ſi elle convient ou non, aux endroits ou il l'employ. Quand les mots Hebreux ſont equivoques, on doit, ce ſemble, avoir egard a la ſignification qui leur eſt propre ſelon les lieux ou ils ſe trouvent, et il eſt ridicule de mettre indifferement toute ſorte de ſignification, ſoit qu'elle convienne, ou qu'elle ne convienne pas. Ce defaut eſt cependant repandu dans toute la verſion d'Arias Montanus, qui a fait paroitre en cela très-peu de judgement. Il. a traduit, par example, preſque en tous les endroits la prepoſition Ebraque *al* par la prepoſition Latine *ſuper*: et cependant on ſait, que cette prepoſition ſignifie dans l'Ebreu tantôt *ſuper*, tantôt *juxta*, et quelquefois *cum*. Il a fait la même choſe à l'egard de la lettre *Lamed* laquelle repond au *pour* des François, ou elle eſt une marque du datif. C'eſt ainſi qu'au chapitre premier de la Geneſe, verſet ſixieme ou Pagnin avoit traduit allez nettement *Dividat aquas ab aquis*, il a traduit ſans aucum ſens *Dividat aquas ad aquas*. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II ch. xx.

† Il y a dans cette derniere reviſion [de la verſion de Geneve] *Alors on commença d' appeller du nom de l'Eternel*. Ce qui fait un ſens obſcur, et même impertinet. Il eſt bien vrai qu' Aquila a traduit mot pour mot de la même maniere: mais il a ſuivi à la lettre le ſens grammatical, et pour peu qu'on ait lû d'Ebreu, on ſait que cette façon de parler *appeller du nom* ſignifie *invoquer le nom* de quelqu'un, principalement quand il eſt parlé de Dieu. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. c. xx. iv.

‡ Les Septante ont traduit Επικαταρατος συ απο παντων των κτηνων, où il y a dans la Vulgate, *Maledictus es inter omnia animantia*: le mot Gree απο, dont les Septante ſe ſont ſervis en cet endroit n'y convient poin, et ne fait aucun ſens. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. v.

two more of Father Simon on the verſion of Eraſmus, in which he cannot indeed accuſe that learned interpreter of departing further either from the letter, or from the ſenſe, than the Vulgate itſelf, but merely of leaving the Vulgate, and rendering the Greek word differently. Simon has in this cauſe a powerful ally, John Bois canon of Ely, a man whom, not without reaſon, he extols for his learning and critical ſagacity; and one who had, beſides, ſuch an attachment to the Vulgate as exactly tallies with his own. For Bois, in every inſtance wherein the Vulgate is literal, finds a freer method looſe, profane, and intolerable; and when the Vulgate follows more the ſenſe than the letter, which is not unfrequently the caſe, no perſon can be more deciſive than he, that the literal method is ſervile, barbarous, unmeaning, and ſuch as befits only a ſchool-boy.

But to return to Simon: "Eraſmus," ſays he *, "rendered not very appoſitely *obſcurant* what in the "Vulgate was *exterminant*, and in the Greek αφανιζουσι. "John Bois, who has defended in this place the La- "tin interpreter, by the authority of Saint Chryſoſ- "tom, who explains the verb αφανιζουσι by διαφθειρουσι, "*they corrupt*, maintains that we ought to give this "meaning to the Latin verb *exterminant*. He con- "demns the new interpreters who have tranſlated "otherwiſe under pretence that this word is not good "Latin. *Parum fortaſſe eleganter*," ſays he, "*verbum* "αφανιζουσι *ſic reddidit, ſed appoſitè ut qui maximè*." But how is the authority of Chryſoſtom concerned in the queſtion? Chryſoſtom, indeed, affirms that αφανιζουσι is in this place equivalent to διαφθειρουσι, but ſays nothing at all of *exterminant*, the only word about which we are in doubt.

For my part, I believe I ſhall not be ſingular in thinking, that it is far from being appoſite in the preſent application. "John Bois," he ſays, "maintains "that we ought to give the ſame meaning with διαφ- "θειρουσι to the Latin verb." But is it in the power of John Bois, or of Richard Simon, or of both, to give what ſenſe they pleaſe to a Latin verb? On this hypotheſis, indeed, they may tranſlate in any way, and defend any tranſlation which they chuſe to patroniſe. But if in Latin, as in all other languages, propriety muſt be determined by uſe, the word *exterminant* is in this place, I ſay not inelegant but improper. It is not chargeable with inelegance, becauſe uſed by good writers, but is charged with impropriety, becauſe unauthoriſed in this acceptation. And even if it ſhould not be quite unexampled, it muſt be admitted to be obſcure and indefinite, on account of the uncommonneſs of the application.

§ 11. THE other example follows †: "Eraſmus' "deſertion of the ancient edition has often ariſen from "the belief that the Latin was not pure enough. For "example, inſtead of ſaying *noluit conſolari*, he has "ſaid *noluit conſolationem admittere*. Yet *conſolari* oc- "curs in the paſſive in ſome ancient authors. Beſides, "this great exactneſs about the propriety of the La- "tin words in a verſion of the Scriptures is not al- "ways ſeaſonable. The interpreter's principal care "ſhould be to expreſs well the ſenſe of the original." True. But to expreſs the ſenſe well, and to give it in proper words, are, in my apprehenſion, very nearly, if not entirely, coincident. I admit, indeed (if that be the author's meaning), that it would not be ſeaſonable to recur to circumlocution, or to affected and far-fetched expreſſions, and avoid ſuch as are ſimple and perſpicuous, becauſe not uſed by the moſt elegant writers. But this is not the caſe here. The expreſſion which Eraſmus has adopted, is ſufficiently plain and ſimple; and, though *conſolari* may ſometimes be found in a paſſive ſignification, there can be no doubt that the active meaning is far the more common. Now, to avoid even the ſlighteſt ambiguity in the verſion, where there is nothing ambiguous in the original, would be a ſufficient reaſon with any man but an Arias or an Aquila, for a greater deviation from the form of the expreſſion, than this can be reaſonably accounted.

§ 12. THIS critical hiſtorian is indeed ſo ſenſible of the futility of the greater part of his remarks on the verſion of Eraſmus, that he, in a manner apologizes for it. "This ſort of alterations," ſays he‡, "ſo "frequent in Eraſmus's verſion, is generally of no "importance; but it would have been more judicious "to alter nothing in the ancient interpreter of the "church, but what it was abſolutely neceſſary to correct,

* Il n'étoit pas à propos qu'Eraſme traduſit *obſcurant*, où il y a dans la Vulgate *exterminant*, et dans le Grec αφανιζουσι (Mat. vi 16) Jean Bois qui a defendu en cet endroit l'interprete Latin par l'autorité de Saint Chryſoſtome, lequel explique le verbe αφανιζουσι par διαφθειρουσι, *corrompent*, pretend qu'on doit donner ce ſens au verbe Latin *exterminant*. Il condamne les nouveaux Interpretes qui ont traduit autrement; ſous pretexte que ce mot n'eſt pas aſſez Latin. Si cette expreſſion, dit il, n'a rien d'elegant, au moins elle eſt très-propre. Hiſt. Crit des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxii.

† Cet éloignement vient ſouvent de ce qu'il [Eraſme] a crû que l'ancienne edition n'eſt pas aſſez Latine. Par example (dans Mat. ii. 18.) au lieu de *noluit conſolari*, il a mis *noluit conſolationem admittere*. On trove cependant *conſolari* au paſſif, dans d'anciens auteurs; outre que cette grande exactitude pour la propriété des mots Latins, dans une verſion de l'Ecriture, n'eſt pas toûjours de ſaiſon. L'on doit principalement prendre garde à bien exprimer le ſens de l'original. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxii.

‡ Ces ſortes de changemens qui ſont frequents dans la verſion d'Eraſme, ſont la pluſpart de nulle importance; mais il étoit plus judicieux de ne changer dans l'ancien interprete de l'egliſe, que ce qu'il étoit abſolument neceſſaire de corriger, pour le rendre plus exact: et peut-être même étoit-il mieux de mettre les corrections à la marge en forme de remarque. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxii.

" rect, in order to render him more exact: and per- " haps it would have been better to put the correc- " tions in the margin in form of remarks." This is a topic to which he is perpetually recurring. It was not unsuitable for one who thought as Father Simon seems sometimes to have done, to use this plea as an argument against making new translations of the Bible into Latin: but it is not at all pertinent to obtrude it upon the readers (as he often does), in the examination of the versions actually made. The question, in regard to these, is, or ought to be, solely concerning the justness of the version. Nor is it easy to conceive another motive for confounding topics so different, but to excite such prejudices in the readers, as may preclude a candid examination.

As to his critique upon the translation made by Erasmus, it appears to me, I own, exceedingly trifling. I believe every impartial reader will be disposed to conclude as much from the examples above produced. And I cannot help adding, in regard to the whole of his criticisms on that version, with the exception of a very few, that they are either injudicious, the changes made by the interpreter being for the better, or frivolous, the changes being, at least, not for the worse. I admit a few exceptions. Thus, the *cui servio* of the Vulgate, is preferable to the *quem colo* of Erasmus, as a version of ὡ λατρευω *, and better suited to the scope of the passage. Λειτουργουσιν δε αυτοις †, could not have been more justly rendered than by the Vulgate, *ministrantibus autem illis*. The expression adopted by Erasmus, *Cum autem illi sacrificarent*, is like one of Beza's stretches, though on a different side. Simon's censure of this passage deserves to be recorded as an evidence of his impartiality, in his theological capacity at least, however much we may think him sometimes biassed as a critic. " Erasmus," says he ‡, " has " limited to the sacrifice, or the public action which " the Greeks call *liturgy*, and the Latins *mass*, that " which, in this place, ought to be understood of the " ministry and functions in general, of the first mini- " sters of the church. He had, therefore, no reason " to reform the version of the ancient interpreter, who " expresses, agreeably both to the letter and to the " sense, the Greek verb λειτουργειν."

Erasmus soon had his imitators, in this particular, among the Romish translators into modern languages. *Corbin*, in his French version, rendered that passage, *Eux celebrans le saint sacrifice de la messe*. After him, Father *Veron*, *Les Apôtres celebroient la messe au Seigneur*. " The reason," says Simon §, " which Veron " offers for translating it in this manner, is because " the Calvinists had often asked him in what passage " of Scripture it was mentioned that the Apostles e- " ver said mass." This plea of Veron is not unlike the mode of reasoning in his own defence, of which I had occasion formerly to produce some examples from Beza ||. That father, that he might not again be at a loss for an answer to such troublesome querists as he had found in those disciples of Calvin, was resolved that, whether the mass had a place in the original or not, or even in the Vulgate, it should stand forth conspicuous in his translation, so that no person could mistake it. The reader will not be surprised to learn, that he was a controvertist by profession, as appears from his addition in the title of his book, " Doc- " teur en Theologie, Predicateur et Lecteur du Roi " pour les Controverses, Deputé par Nosseigneurs du " Clergé, pour ecrire sur icelles." And to show of what consequence he thought these particulars were to qualify him as a translator, he observes in the preface ¶, that, " the quality of holy writ well deserves, " on several important accounts, that its translators " should be doctors in theology, and especially well " versed in controversies." Simon's observation on this sentiment, merits our utmost attention: " It is true," says he **, " that it were to be wished that " those who meddle with translating the Bible, were " learned in theology; but it should be another sort " of theology than the controversial; for it frequent- " ly happens, that controvertists discover in the Bible " things not in it, and that they limit the significa- " tions of the words by their own ideas."

§ 13. Bur, to return to the detection I have attempted of Simon's partiality as a critic, and of the contradictory arguments in which he is often involved by it; we should think him sometimes as much attached to the letter, and even to the arrangement of the

* Rom. i. 9. † Acts, xiii. 2.

‡ Il a limité au sacrifice ou à l'action publique que les Grecs appellent *liturgie*, et les Latins *messe*, ce qu'on doit entendre en ce lieu-là generalement du ministere et des fonctions des premiers ministres de l'eglise. Il n'a donc pas eu raison de reformer la version de l'ancien interprete, qui exprime très-bien à la letre, et selon le sens, le verbe Grec λειτουργειν. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

§ La raison qu'il apporte de sa traduction en cet endroit, est que les Calvinistes lui avoient souvent demandé en quel lieu de l'Ecriture il étoit marqué que les apôtres eussent dit la messe. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxi.

|| Diff. X. Part V. § 5, 6. 9.

¶ La qualité de l'Ecriture sainte merite bien aussi pour divers chefs que ses traducteurs soient docteurs en theologie, et bien versez specialement aux controverses. Ibid.

** Il est vrai qu'il seroit à desirer que ceux qui se mêlent de traduire la bible fussent sçavans dans la theologie: mais ce doit être une autre theologie que celle qui regarde la controverse; car il arrive souvent que les controversistes voyent dans la bible des choses qui n'y sont point, et qu'ils en limitent quelquefois les mots selon leurs idées. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxi.

the words in the original, as any devotee of the ſynagogue; and at other times diſpoſed to allow great freedoms in both reſpects. When we examine into the reaſon of this inconſiſtency, we always find that the former is a prelude to the defence of the Vulgate in general, or of ſome obſcure and barbarous expreſſion in that verſion; the latter is often, but not always, in vindication of ſomething in the Vulgate, expreſſed more freely than perhaps was expedient, or, at leaſt, neceſſary; for there are great inequalities in that tranſlation. I ſay, in this caſe, *often*, but not *always*; becauſe, as was hinted before, when there is no ſcope for party-attachment, his own good ſenſe determines him to prefer thoſe who keep cloſe to the meaning before thoſe who keep cloſe to the letter.

"It flows," ſays he *, "from want of reſpect for "the writings of the Apoſtles, to tranſpoſe the order "of their words, under pretence that this tranſpoſi- "tion forms a clearer and more natural ſenſe. This "may properly be remarked, but it is not allowable "to make ſuch a change in the text." Again †: "Peo- "ple of ſenſe will prefer the barbariſm of the anci- "ent Latin edition to the politeneſs of Eraſmus, be- "cauſe it is no fault, in an interpretation of Scripture, "to follow cloſely his original, and to exhibit even "its tranſpoſitions of words. If the interpreter of "the church does not employ Latin terms ſufficiently "pure, it is becauſe he is determined to render faith- "fully the words of his original. It is eaſy to reme- "dy, by ſhort notes, ſuch pretended faults."

The preceding obſervations and reaſoning he has himſelf anſwered in another place, in a way that is quite ſatisfactory. "A tranſlator of Scripture," ſays "he ‡, "ought to take care not to attach himſelf en- "tirely to the order of the words in the original; "otherwiſe, it will be impoſſible for him to avoid "falling into ambiguities; becauſe the languages do "not accord with each other in every thing." Again § : A tranſlator ought not ſimply to count the "words; but he ought, beſides, to examine in what "manner they may be joined together, ſo as to form "a good meaning; otherwiſe his tranſlation will be "puerile and ridiculous." In another place he is ſtill more indulgent ‖: "One ought, doubleſs, to conſi- "der the difference of the languages: our manners "and our expreſſions do not ſuit thoſe of the ancient "Orientals. For this reaſon, I agree with Father "Amelote, that it was not neceſſary that he ſhould "employ the conjunction *and* in all the places where "it is found in the New Teſtament, becauſe this re- "petition ſhocks us; as do alſo theſe other particles, "*behold*, *now*, *then*, *becauſe*. I am convinced that "Amelote did right in ſubſtituting others in their "ſtead."

If it ſhould be aſked, Why does not Simon enjoin rather, in thoſe places, to trace the letter, at all hazards, in the text, and recur to the margin, his never-failing reſource on other occaſions, for what regards the meaning? I know no pertinent anſwer that can be given, unleſs that, in the places juſt now quoted, he is not engaged in defending the obſcurities, and even the nonſenſe of the Vulgate, againſt the plain ſenſe of other verſions.

§ 14. To thoſe above cited, I ſhall add but a few other ſpecimens. "It is," ſays he ¶, "much more "proper, in a tranſlation of the ſacred books into the "vulgar tongue, to attach one's ſelf, as much as poſ- "ſible to the letter, than to give meanings too free "in quitting it." Again **: "This reſpect is due to "the ſacred books, which cannot be too literally in- "terpreted, provided they be made intelligible." This ſentiment appears moderate, on a general view; yet, when applied to particular caſes, it will not be found to be that author's ſentiment. And, what may be thought more extraordinary, this rule of his will be found

* Ce n'eſt pas auſſi avoir aſſez de reſpect pour les ecrits des apôtres, que de tranſpoſer l'ordre des mots ſous pretexte que cette tranſpoſition forme un ſens plus net et plus natural. Il eſt bon de remarquer; mais il n'eſt pas permis de faire ce changement dans le texte. Hiſt. Crit. des Com. du N. T. ch. lx.

† Le gens de bon ſens prefereront la barbarie de l'ancienne edition Latine à la politeſſe d'Eraſme, parceque ce n'eſt pas un defaut dans un interprete de l'Ecriture de ſuivre fidelement ſon original, et d'en repreſenter juſqu'aux hyperbates. Si l'interprete de l'egliſe ne s'explique pas en des termes Latins aſſez purs c'eſt qu'il s'eſt attaché a rendre fidelement le mots de ſon original. Il eſt aiſé de remedier à ces pretendus defauts par de petites notes.

‡ Un traducteur de l'Ecriture doit pendre garde à ne s'attacher pas entierement à l'ordres des mots qui eſt dans l'original; autrement il ſera impoſſible qu'il ne tombe dans des equivoques, parce que les langues ne ſe raportent pas en tout les unes aux autres. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. III. ch. ii.

§ Un traducteur ne doit pas compter ſimplement les mots; mais il doit de-plus examiner, de quelle maniere on les peut joindre enſemble pour former un bon ſens; autrement ſa traduction ſera puerile et ridicule. Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

‖ On doit à la veri é conſiderer la difference de langues, nos manieres et nos expreſſions ne s'accordant point avec celles des anciens peuples d'Orient Sur ce pied-là je conviens, avec le P. Amelote, qu'il n'a pas été neceſſaire qu'il employât la conjunction *et* das tous les endroits ou elle ſe trouve dans le Nouveau Teſtament, parce que cette repetition nous choque, auſſi bien que ces autres particules, *voila*, *donc*, *or*, *parce que*. Je ſuis même perſuadé qu'il en a pû ſubſtituer d'autres en leur place. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxiii

¶ Il eſt bien plus à propos dans une traduction des livres ſacrés en langue vulgaire, de s'attacher à la lettre autant qu'il eſt poſſible que de donner des ſens trop libres en la quitant. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

** On doit avoir ce reſpect pour le livres ſacrés qui ne peuvent être traduits trop à la lettre, pourveu qu'on ſe faſſe entendre. Hiſt. Crit des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

found to require, when judged by his own criticisms, both too much and too little.

First, it requires too much; because it implies that we are never to forsake the letter, unless when, by adhering to it, the expression might be rendered unintelligible. Yet, in a quotation lately given from that author, he admits, that the particles *and*, *behold*, *now*, *then*, *because*, may be either omitted or changed, and that not on account of their hurting the sense, which they rarely do, but expressly, because the frequent recurrence of such words shocks us, that is, offends our ears. An additional evidence of the same thing is, the exception he takes to Munster's translation, which he declares it to be too literal, and consequently rude, though, at the same time, he acknowledges it to be sufficiently intelligible *. The sacred books, then, may be too literally interpreted, though they be made intelligible. Assertions more manifestly contradictory it is impossible to conceive.

Secondly, the rule he has given us requires too little; because it evidently implies that the letter ought to be deserted, when to do so is necessary for expressing the sense perspicuously. Now, if that had been uniformly our critic's opinion, we should never have had so many recommendations of the margin for correcting the ambiguities, false meanings, and no meanings, which a rigorous adherence to the letter had brought into text of the Vulgate, and which he will not permit to be changed in other versions.

§ 15. I HAVE already given it as my opinion, that Father Simon's sentiments on this subject, when unbiassed by any special purpose, were rational and liberal. I have given some evidences of this, and intend to add a few more. Speaking of the Greek version of the Old Testament, by Aquila the Jew, he says †, "One cannot excuse this interpreter's vicious "affectation (which St Jerom has named κακοζηλια, "or *ridiculous zeal*), in translating translating every "word of his text entirely by the letter, and in so "rigid a manner, as to render his version altogether "barbarous." Again ‡: "The Seventy, who trans-"late the Hebrew often too literally, and sometimes "even without minding the sense, do not always ex-"actly hit the meaning; and they render themselves "obscure, by an excessive attachment to the letter." Of Arias' translation he says §: "It is true, that "this version may be useful to those who are learn-"ing Hebrew, because it renders the Hebrew word "for word, according to the grammatical sense; but "I do not think that one ought therefore to give Ari-"as Montanus the character of *a most faithful inter-*"*preter*: on the contrary, one will do him much "more justice, in naming him *a most trifling inter-*"*preter*."

Agreeably to this more enlarged, and, indeed, more accurate way of thinking, the critic did not hesitate to pronounce this expression of Munster: *Fructificate et augescite, et implete aquas in fretis*, much inferior to that of the Vulgate, *Crescite et multiplicamini, et implete aquas maris* ‖. I am of the same opinion as to the passages compared, though I have no partiality to the Vulgate. Yet, by Simon's rule, above quoted, Munster's version here ought to be preferred. It is equally intelligible, and more literal. Nor is the word *fructificate* more exceptionable in point of Latinity, than many words in the Vulgate which he strenuously defends; accusing those who object to them, of an excess of delicacy, but ill suited to the subject. His friend, the canon of Ely, if it had been a term of the ancient interpreter, would have told us boldly, and, in my opinion, with better reason when he so expressed himself, *Parum fortasse eleganter verbum* פרו *pheru, sic reddidit; sed appositè, ut qui maximè.* The same fault, of being too literal, and sometimes tracing etymologies, he finds in Beza. "What has often de-"ceived Beza," says he ¶, "and the other translator's "of Geneva, is their thinking to render the Greek "more literally, by attaching themselves to expres "etymologies. They have not considered that it is "proper only for school-boys to translate in this man-"ner." To these let me add the testimony of his apologists

* Quoique la version soit assez intelligible, elle a neanmoins quelque chose de rude, parce qu'elle suit trop la lettre du texte Ebreu. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xxi.

† On ne peut pas excuser cet interprete d'une affectation vicieuse (que St Jerome a nommé κακοζηλιαν, ou *zele ridicule*) d'autant qu'il a traduit chaque mot de son texte entierement à la lettre, et d'une maniere si rigoureuse, que cela a rendu sa version tout-a-fait barbare. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II.

‡ Les Septante qui traduisent souvent l'Ebreu trop à la lettre, et quelquefois même sans prendre garde au sens, ne font pas toujours un choix exact du veritable sens, et ils se rendent obscurs, pour s'attacher trop à la lettre. Hist. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xiii.

§ Il est vrai que cette version peut être utile à ceux qui veulent apprendre la langue Ebraique, parce qu'elle rend l'Hebreu mot pour mot et selon le sens grammatical: mais je ne croi pas qu'on doive donner pour cela a Arias Montanus la qualité de *fidissimus interpres*: au contraire, on lui fera beacoup plus de justice, en le nommant *ineptissimus interpres*. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

‖ Gen. i 22. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xxi.

¶ Ce qui a souvent trompé Beze et les autres traducteurs de Geneve, c'est qu'ils ont crû rendre les mots Grecs plus à la lettres, s'ils s'attachoient à exprimer jusqu'aux etymologies. Ils n'ont pas considéré qu'il n'y a que des ecoliers qui soient capables de traduire de cette maniere. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxvi.

logiſt, Hieronymus Le Camus*: "When they ren-
"der the Hebrew word for word, they do not ſpeak
"pure Greek. This Simon calls κακοζηλια, or a vi-
"cious affectation familiar to Jewiſh interpreters, and
"occurring ſometimes in the Septuagint. Thus,
"when they turn ſome prepoſitions from Hebrew into
"Greek, they retain the Hebrew idiom; for exam-
"ple, in Hebrew, the comparative is expreſſed by
"the prepoſition *min*, which the Seventy, and Aqui-
"la, often render απο, *from*; in which caſe, this
"κακοζηλια darkens the ſenſe." Was there none of
this κακοζηλια then, in uſing the prepoſition *in* (where
the idiom of the Latin, and the ſenſe of the expreſſion,
required *cum*), in the phraſe *in virtute* of the Vul-
gate†.

§ 16. But it is certain that, whatever were his ge-
neral ſentiments on the ſubject, he no ſooner deſcend-
ed to particular inſtances, than he patronized the
free or the literal manner, juſt as the one or the other
had been followed by the Vulgate. If he had ſaid,
in ſo many words, that the example of the ancient
interpreter was a ſufficient reaſon, the queſtion would
have been more ſimple. But, whatever weight this
ſentiment might have had with Romaniſts, to whom
that verſion ſerves as a ſtandard, it could not ſurely
have had influence enough on Proteſtants, to make
them ſacrifice what they judged to be the ſenſe of the
unerring Spirit, in deference to the diſcovered miſtakes
of a fallible tranſlator. It was, therefore, of impor-
tance to Father Simon, for the conviction of his Pro-
teſtant readers, to ſhow, from the authentic principles
of criticiſm, that, in every thing material, the old
tranſlator had judged better than any of the later in-
terpreters; and, in proſecution of this momentous
point, I have given a ſpecimen of his wonderful ver-
ſatility in arguing. That I may not be miſunderſtood,
I muſt, at the ſame time, add, that he does not carry
his partiality ſo far, as to refuſe acknowledging, in
the Vulgate, a few ſlips of no conſequence, and no-
wiſe affecting the ſenſe. To have acted otherwiſe,
would have been too inartificial in that critic, as it
would have expoſed the great object of his treatiſe, too
much. Some conceſſions it was neceſſary that he
ſhould employ, as an expedient for gaining the ac-
quieſcence of his readers in points incomparably more
important.

§ 17. I shall now finiſh what I have to remark
upon his criticiſms, with ſome reflections on thoſe
words which, in conſequence of the frequency of
their occurrence, both in the Vulgate, and in anci-
ent eccleſiaſtical writers, he conſiders as conſecrated,
and as therefore entitled to be preferred to other
words, which are equally ſignificant, but have not
had the ſame advantage of antiquity and theological
uſe. I readily admit the title claimed in behalf of
ſuch words, when they convey exactly the idea de-
noted by the original terms, and are neither obſcure
nor ambiguous: nay, I do not object even to their
ambiguity, when the ſame ambiguity is in the origi-
nal term. And this is, in my opinion, the utmoſt
which ought to be demanded on one ſide, or yielded
on the other. If, on account of the uſage of any for-
mer interpreter, I admit words which convey not the
ſame idea with the original, or which convey it dark-
ly, or which convey alſo other ideas that may be miſ-
taken for the true, or confounded with it; I make a
ſacrifice of the truths of the Spirit, that I may pay a
vain compliment to antiquity, in adopting its phraſe-
ology, even when it may miſlead. That the words
themſelves be equally plain and pertinent with any
other words which might occur, appears to me ſo
reaſonable a limitation to the preference granted in
favour of thoſe uſed in any former verſion, that I do
not know any topic by which I could convince per-
ſon's of a different opinion, if the bare ſtating of the
matter, as is done above, be not ſufficient. But, per-
haps, it will anſwer better to deſcend to particulars.
It is only thus a perſon can be aſſured of making him-
ſelf thoroughly underſtood.

§ 18. Simon, ſpeaking of the Lutheran and Port
Royal verſions ſays ‡, "Neither of them retains almoſt
"any thing of that venerable and quite divine appear-
"ance which Scripture has in the original languages.
"One does not find, in theſe verſions, that ſimplici-

* Quando verba Ebraica ita reddunt, ut verbum de verbo exprimant, minus Græcè loquuntur; et hoc Simonius vocavit κακοζηλιαν ſeu pravam affectationem Judæis interpretibus familiarem, quæ etiam interdum in ſeptuaginta interpretibus occurrit. Sic ium quaſdam præpoſitiones ex Ebræo faciunt Græcas, retinent dictionem Ebraicam: exempli causâ, ſermo Ebraicus comparativum exprimit per *min* quod 70 cum Aquila haud infrequenter reddunt απο *ab*. Tunc iſta κακοζηλια ſenſum efficit obſcurum. Hier. le Cam. De Reſponſione Voſſii, edit. Edinb. 1658, p. 50. † Rom. i. 2. See § 7. of this Diſſertation.

‡ Les uns et les autres ne retiennent preſque rien de cet air venerable et tout divin que l'Ecriture a dans les langues originales. On n'y trouve point cette ſimplicité de ſtile qui eſt repandüe dans les ecrits des Evangeliſtes et des Apôtres.—Cela paroit dès les premiers mots de la traduction de Mons, où nous liſons, *la genealogie de Jeſus Chriſt*: et en effet ces deux mots Latins, *liber generationis*, qui repondent à deux autres qui ſont dans le Grec, ſignifient *genealogie*. Mais un interprete qui voudra conſerver cet air ſimple que les livres ſacrés ont dans les langues originales, aimera mieux traduire ſimplement *le livre de la generation*. Il remarquera en même tems à la marge, que dans le ſtile de la bible on appelle βιβλος γενεσεως ce que les Grecs nomment γενεαλογια, *genealogie*; que les Apôtres ont pris cette expreſſion de la verſion Grecque des Septante, qui ont ainſi interpreté le *ſepher-toldoth* des Ebreux. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

" ty of ſtyle which is diffuſed through the writings of " the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts. This appears from " the firſt words of the tranſlation of Mons, where " we read, *La genealogie de Jeſus Chriſt:* in effect, " the two Latin words, *liber generationis*, anſwering " to two others in the Greek, ſignify *genealogy*. But " an interpreter, who chuſes to preſerve that ſimple " air which the ſacred books have in the original " tongues, will rather tranſlate, ſimply, *the book of the* " *generation*. He will remark, at the ſame time, on " the margin, that in the ſtyle of the Bible, one calls " βιβλος γενεσεως what the Greeks name γενεαλογια *gene-* " *alogy*; that the Apoſtles have adopted this expreſ- " ſion from the Greek verſion of the Seventy, who " have thus expreſſed the *ſepher-toldoth* of the He- " brews."

Now it may be obſerved, that Simon himſelf ſpeaks of it as unqueſtionable, that *genealogie* expreſſes the meaning. But he objects, that it is not ſo ſimple an expreſſion as *le livre de la generation*. If he had called it too learned a term for uſhering in ſo plain a narrative as the Goſpel, I ſhould have thought the objection plauſible. But when he ſpeaks of ſimplicity, I am afraid that he has ſome meaning to that word which I am not acquainted with. I ſhould never imagine, that of different ways of expreſſing the ſame idea, ſuppoſing the expreſſions in other reſpects equal, that ſhould be accounted the leaſt ſimple, which is in the feweſt words. Or, if the phraſe, *le livre de la generation*, do not derive its ſuperior ſimplicity from its being more complex; does it derive that quality from its being more obſcure than *la genealogie?* I have been accuſtomed to conſider plainneſs, rather than obſcurity, as characteriſtic of ſimplicity. And, indeed, the chief fault I find in the former of theſe expreſſions, is its obſcurity. The word *livre* is here uſed in a ſenſe which it never has in French; as much may be ſaid of the word *generation:* and conſequently the phraſe does not convey intelligibly the idea of the writer, or, indeed, any idea whatever. Our author's anſwer to this is: 'Give the ſenſe on the margin;' that is, in other words, give the etymology of the phraſe in the text, and the tranſlation in the margin. Is not this the very method taken by Arias Montanus, whom our critic has, nevertheleſs, treated very contemptuouſly? Is not this hunting after etymological ſignifications, the very thing he condemns ſo ſtrongly in Beza, and ſome other modern interpreters? And where is the difference, whether the expreſſion to be explained, be a phraſe or a compound word; for a compound word is no other than a contracted phraſe? Γενεαλογια is but two words, γενεας λογος, contracted into one. This our author admits to be a juſt (and, I add, a literal) verſion of *ſepher toldoth*. Now, if the Evangeliſt had employed this, inſtead of βιβλος γενεσεως, Simon would have had the ſame reaſon for inſiſting that it ought to be rendered, in the text, *la parole de la generation*, and that the meaning ſhould be explained in the margin.

Sometimes, indeed, this way of interpreting, by tracing the etymology, is proper, becauſe ſometimes it conveys the ſenſe with ſufficient perſpicuity, and with as much brevity as the language admits: but this is not the caſe always. Every body will allow, that φιλησοντες could not be more juſtly rendered than *lovers of pleaſure*, or φιλοθεοι, than *lovers of God*. But συκοφαντα is much better tranſlated *falſe accuſers*, than *informers concerning figs*; φιλοσοφοι, *philoſophers*, than *lovers of wiſdom*. The apoſtolical admonition *, Βλεπετε μη τις υμας εσται ὁ συλαγωγων δια της φιλοσοφιας, is certainly better rendered, *Beware leaſt any man ſeduce you through philoſophy*, than, Beware leſt any man carry you off a prey, through the love of wiſdom; which, though it traces the letter, does not give the ſenſe. Yet, in theſe caſes, the terms may be pertinently explained in the margin, as well as in that mentioned by the critic. Now, to qualify one for the office of interpreter, it is requiſite that he be capable of giving the received uſe of the phraſes, as well as of the compound words, and of the compound words, as well as of the ſimple words.

There are caſes in which I have acknowledged, that recourſe to the margin is neceſſary; but ſuch caſes are totally different from the preſent, as will appear to the ſatisfaction of any one who has attended to what has been ſaid † on that ſubject. But the method, ſo often recommended by Simon, is, in my apprehenſion, the moſt bungling imaginable. It is unnaturally to disjoin two eſſential parts of the tranſlator's buſineſs, the interpretation of words, and the interpretation of idioms, or phraſes, allotting the text, or body of the book, for the one, and reſerving the margin for the other. In conſequence of which, the text will be often no better than a collection of riddles, or, what is worſe, a jargon of unmeaning words; whilſt that which alone deſerves the name of interpretation, will be found in the margin. This naturally ſuggeſts a query, Whether the text might not as well be diſpenſed with altogether; as it would only ſerve to interrupt a reader's progreſs, diſtract his attention, and divide his thoughts? To this let me add another query, Whether there be any thing in the tranſlations of Aquila, Malvenda, Arias Montanus, Pagnin, and Beza (for they all incur this ſtigma from our author, when they tranſlate more literally than the Vulgate), which better deſerves the denomination of a ſchool-boy's verſion, than that which the author, in this place, ſo ſtrongly patronizes?

§ 19.

* Col. ii. 8. † Diſſ. II. Part I. § 5. Diſſ. VIII. throughout.

§ 19 I OBSERVED, that compound words are nearly on the ſame footing with ſuch phraſes as βιβλος γενεσεως. This holds more manifeſtly in Hebrew, where the nouns which are ſaid, by their grammarians, to be *in ſtatu conſtructo*, are, in effect, compound terms. To combine them the more eaſily, a change is, in certain caſes, made on the letters of the word which we ſhould call the governing word; and when there is no change in the letters, there is often, by the Maſoretic reading, a change in the vowel-points to facilitate the pronunciation of them as one word. In this way, *ſepher-toldoth* is as truly one compound word in Hebrew, as γενεαλογια is in Greek, and of the ſame ſignification. There is a ſimilar idiom in the French language, for ſupplying names, by what may be termed, indifferently, phraſes, or compound nouns. Such are, *gens d' armes*, *jet d' eau*, *aide de camp*. We ſhould think a tranſlator had much of the κακοζηλια, the vicious affectation ſo oft above mentioned, who ſhould render them into Engliſh, *people of arms*, *caſt of water*, *help of field*. Another evidence that this may juſtly be regarded as a kind of compoſition in Hebrew, is that, when there is occaſion for the affix pronouns, though their connection be in ſtrictneſs with the firſt of the two terms, they are annexed to the ſecond, which would be utterly repugnant to their ſyntax, if both were not conſidered as making but one word, and, conſequently, as not admitting the inſertion of a pronoun between them. Thus, what is rendered*, *his idols of ſilver*, and *his idols of gold*; if the two nouns in each phraſe were not conceived as combined into one compound term, ought to be tranſlated, *idols of his ſilver*, and *idols of his gold*, ואת אלילי והכו את אלילי כספו, which is not according to the genius of that language, for the affix pronouns are never tranſpoſed.

But when the words are conſidered in this (which I think is the true) light, as one compound name, there is the ſame reaſon for rendering them as our interpreters have done, that there would be to render ἡ φιλανθρωπια αυτου, *his love to men*, and not *love to his men*. In the ſame manner, and שם קדשי *ſhem codſhi*, *is my holy name*, הר קדשי *har codſhi*, *my holy mountain*, and קדשי שמן *ſhemen codſhi*, *my holy oil*. Theſe, if we ſhould follow the letter in tranſlating them, or, which is the ſame thing, trace the form of the compoſition, muſt be *the name of my holineſs*, *the mountain of my holineſs*, and *the oil of my holineſs*. In tranſlating אלהי צדקי† *elohe tſidki*, rendered, in the common verſion, *O God of my righteouſneſs*, I ſee no occaſion, with Dr. Taylor, to make a ſtretch to find a meaning to the word anſwering to *righteouſneſs*; the word, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom above exemplified, has there manifeſtly the force of an epithet, and the expreſſion implies no more than *my righteous God*. In this way עם קדשך‡ *gham kedſhecha* (which is exactly ſimilar), tranſlated in the Engliſh Bible, after Tremellius, and much in the manner of Arias, *the people of thy holineſs*, is rendered in the Vulgate, and by Houbigant, *populum ſanctum tuum*, *thy holy people*, and to the ſame purpoſe by the tranſlator of Zuric and Caſtalio. This very thing, therefore, that the Seventy did not render *ſepher-toldoth*, γενεαλογια, to which it literally, and in ſignification, anſwers, but βιβλος γενεσεως, is an example of that κακοζηλια, of which Jerom juſtly accuſes them, and which Simon never fails to cenſure with ſeverity, in every tranſlation where he finds it, except the Vulgate. As this phraſe, however, in conſequence of its introduction by theſe interpreters, obtained a currency among the Helleniſt Jews, and was quite intelligible to them, being in the national idiom, it was proper in the Evangeliſt to adopt it. The caſe was totally different with thoſe for whom the Latin verſion was made, whoſe idiom the words *liber generationis* did not ſuit, and to whoſe ear they conveyed only unmeaning ſounds.

§ 20. I HAVE never ſeen Mr Simon's French tranſlation of the New Teſtament from the Vulgate, but I have an Engliſh verſion of his verſion, by William Webſter, curate of St Dunſtan's in the Weſt. The Engliſh tranſlator profeſſes, in his dedication, to have tranſlated literally from the French. Yet Matthew's Goſpel begins in this manner: *The genealogy of Jeſus Chriſt*. If Mr Webſter has taken the freedom to alter Simon's phraſe, he acted very ſtrangely, as it is hardly in the power of imagination to conceive a good reaſon for turning that work (which is itſelf but a tranſlation of a tranſlation) into Engliſh; unleſs to ſhew, as nearly as poſſible, that eminent critic's manner of applying his own rules, and to let us into his notions of the proper method of tranſlating holy writ. And if, on the other hand, Simon has actually rendered it in French, *La genealogie*, it is no leſs ſtrange that, without aſſigning a reaſon for his change of opinion, or ſo much as mentioning, in the preface, or in a note, that he had, changed it, he ſhould employ an expreſſion which he had, in a work of high reputation, cenſured with ſo much ſeverity in another §.

* Iſaiah ii. 20. † Pſalm iv. 1. ‡ Iſaiah lxiii. 18.

§ I have, ſince theſe Diſſertations were finiſhed, been fortunate enough to procure a copy of Simon's French tranſlation of the New Teſtament; from which I find that his Engliſh tranſlator has not miſrepreſented him. Without any apology either in the preface or in the notes, he adopts the very expreſſion which he had in ſo deciſive a manner condemned in the Gentlemen of Port Royal. Nay, ſo little does he value the rule which he had ſo often preſcribed to others, to give a literal verſion in the text, and the meaning in the margin, that in moſt caſes, as in the preſent, he reverſes it; he gives the meaning in the text, and the the literal verſion in the margin. I think, that in ſo doing, he judge much better; but if further experience produced this alteration

§ 21. Now if, from what has been ſaid, it be evident, that his own principles, explicitly declared in numberleſs parts of his book, as well as right reaſon, condemn the ſervile method of tracing etymologies in words or phraſes (for there is no material difference in the caſes), to the manifeſt injury of perſpicuity, and, conſequently of the ſenſe; I know no tolerable plea which can be advanced in favour of ſuch phraſes, unleſs that to which he often recurs in other caſes, *conſecration by long uſe*. "Why," he aſks *, ſpeaking of the Port Royal tranſlation, "have they baniſhed from this "verſion many words which long uſe has authoriſed, "and which have been, ſo to ſpeak, canonized in the Weſtern churches?" He does not, indeed, plead this in defence of the words *liber generationis*, though, in my opinion, the moſt plauſible argument he had to offer. But as it is a principal topic with him, to which he often finds it neceſſary to recur, it will require a more particular examination.

§ 22. "WHERE we have, in the Greek," ſays he†, "ευαγγελιζονται, and the Vulgate *evangelizantur*, Eraſ-"mus has tranſlated, *Lætum evangelii accipiunt nuntium*. "He explains, by ſeveral words, what might have "been rendered by one only, which is not, indeed, "Latin, but as the learned John Bois remarks, it is "ancient, and is, beſides, as current as ſeveral other "words which eccleſiaſtic uſe has rendered familiar. "He adds, in the ſame place, that he is not ſhocked with "this expreſſion in our Vulgate, *qui non fuerit ſcan-"dalizatus*, becauſe he is for allowing the Goſpel to "ſpeak after its own manner. Eraſmus has tranſlated, "*Quiſquis non fuerit offenſus*, which is better Latin." In regard to the laſt expreſſion, he has a ſimilar remark in his critique on the verſion of Mons. "Theſe "words," ſays he‡, "*Si oculus tuus dexter ſcandalizat "te*, the gentlemen of Port Royal have tranſlated *Si "*votre œil droit vous eſt un ſuget de ſcandale et de chute*. "They ſay that the word *ſcandale*, by itſelf, conveys "commonly another idea, denoting that which ſhocks "us, not that which makes us fall. But St Jerom, "whom they pretend to imitate, was not ſo delicate. "We ſhould not, however, have found fault with "their explaining the word *ſcandale*, ſcandal, by the "word *chute*, fall: but this explanation ought to have "been in the margin, rather than in the text of the "verſion."

§ 23. As to what regards the proper verſion of the words ευαγγελιζω and ευαγγελιον, I have explained myſelf fully in ſome former Diſſertations §, and ſhall only add here a few things ſuggeſted by the remarks above quoted. Firſt, then, Mr Simon condemns it much in a tranſlator, to explain, by ſeveral words, what might have been rendered by one only. I condemn it no leſs than he. But, by the examples produced, one would conclude that he had meant, not *what might have been*, but *what could not have been*, rendered by one only; for *evangelizantur* is not a verſion of ευαγγελιζονται, nor *ſcandalizatus fuerit* of σκανδαλισθη. This is merely to give the Greek words ſomething of a Latin form and ſo evade tranſlating them altogether. A verſion, compoſed on this plan, if without abſurdity we could call it a verſion, would be completely barbarous and unintelligible. There are a very few caſes wherein it is neceſſary to retain the original term. Theſe I have deſcribed already ‖. But neither of the words now mentioned falls under the deſcription. And common ſenſe is enough to ſatisfy us, that when a word cannot be tranſlated intelligibly by one word only, the interpreter ought to employ more. *Verba ponderanda ſunt*, ſays Houbigant ¶, *non numeranda—Neque enim fieri poteſt, ut duarum linguarum paria ſemper verba paribus reſpondeant*.

Secondly, That a word is familiar to us, is no evidence that we underſtand it, though this circumſtance, its familiarity, often prevents our diſcovering that we do not underſtand it.

Thirdly, Eccleſiaſtical uſe is no ſecurity that the word,

tion in his ſentiments, it is ſtrange that he ſeems never to have reflected that he owed to the public ſome account of ſo glaring an inconſiſtency in his conduct; and to thoſe tranſlators whoſe judgment he had treated with ſo little ceremony, an acknowledgment of his error. Simon's tranſlation is, upon the whole, a good one, but it will not bear to be examined by his own rules and maxims.

* Pourquoi a-t on banni pluſieurs mots qu'un long uſage a autorizés, et qui ont été, pour ainſi dire, canoniſes dans les egliſes d'Occident. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

† Ou il y a dans le Grec (Mat. xi. 5.) ευαγγελιζονται, et dans la Vulgate *evangelizantur* Eraſme a traduit *lætum Evangelii accipiunt nuntium*. Il explique par pluſieurs mots ce qu'il pouvoit rendre par un ſeul, qui n'eſt pas à la verité Latin, mais, comme le docte Jean Bois a remarqué, il eſt ancien, et il eſt auſſi bien de miſe que pluſieurs autres mots auxquels l'uſage de l'egliſe a donné cours. Il ajoute au même endroit, qu'il n'eſt point choqué de cette expreſſion qui eſt dans nôtre Vulgate, *qui non fuerit ſcandalizatus*, parce qu'il ſouffre volontiers que l'Evangile parle à ſa maniere. Eraſme a traduit, *quiſquis non fuerit offenſus*; ce qui eſt plus Latin. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxii.

‡ Ces paroles (Mat. v. 29.), *Si oculus tuus dexter ſcandalizat te*, Meſſieurs de Port Royale ont traduit par celles-ci, *Si votre œil droit vous eſt un ſuget de ſcandale et de chute*. Ils diſent que le mot de *ſcandale* tout ſeul donne d'ordinaire une autre idée, et et qu'ils ſe prend pour ce qui nous choque, et non pas pour ce qui nous fait tomber. Mais St Jerôme qu'ils pretendent imiter, n'a point eu cette delicateſſe. On ne trouve pas neanmoins mauvais qu'ils ayent expliqué le mot de *ſcandale* par celui de *chute*: mais cette explication devoit piûtôt être à la marge, que dans le texte de la verſion. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

§ Diſſ. V. Part II. Diſſ. VI. Part V. ‖ Diſſ. VIII. paſſim. ¶ Proleg. Cap. V. Art. III.

word, though it be underſtood, conveys to us the ſame idea which the original term did to thoſe to whom the Goſpels were firſt promulged. In in a former Diſſertation, the fulleſt evidence has been given that, in regard to ſeveral words, the meaning which has been long eſtabliſhed by eccleſiaſtic uſe, is very different from that which they have in the writings of the New Teſtament.

Fourthly, That to render the plain Greek words σκανδαλίζω and εὐαγγελίζω into Latin, by the words *ſcandalizo* and *evangelizo*, which are not Latin words, is ſo far from allowing the Goſpel to ſpeak after its own manner (as Bois call it), that it is, on the contrary, giving it a manner of ſpeaking the moſt different from its own that can be imagined. This I intend ſoon to evince, even from Simon himſelf, though in the paſſage above referred to, he ſeems to have adopted the ſentiment of the Engliſh critic.

Laſtly, The argument implied in the remark, that Jerom had not ſo much delicacy as the tranſlators of Port Royal, becauſe he did not ſcruple to employ the word *ſcandalizo*, though not Latin, in his Latin verſion, admits a twofold anſwer. The firſt is, Jerom did wrong in ſo doing. Simon acknowledges that he was neither infallible nor inſpired; he acknowledges, further, that he might, and in a few inſtances did, miſtake, and is, by conſequence, not implicitly to be followed. "It would be wrong," ſays the critic, in a paſſage formerly quoted, "to imitate the faults of "St Jerom, and to pay greater deference to his au-"thority than to the truth." The ſecond anſwer is, that the caſes are not parallel. *Scandalum* was not a Latin word; conſequently, to thoſe who underſtood no Greek, it was obſcure, or, if you will, unintelligible. This is the worſt that could be ſaid. Jerom, or whoever firſt introduced it into the Latin verſion, had it in his power to aſſign it, in a note, what ſenſe he pleaſed. But *ſcandale* was a French word, before the tranſlators of Mons had a being; and it was not in their power to divert it from the meaning which general uſe had given it long before. Now, as they juſtly obſerve, in their own vindication, the import of the French word did not coincide with that of the orignal; they were, therefore, by all the rules of interpretation, obliged to adopt another. Jerom, by adopting the word *ſcandalum*, darkened the meaning; they, by uſing the word *ſcandale*, would have given a falſe meaning. Their only fault, in my opinion, was their admitting an improper word into their verſion, even though coupled with another which expreſſes the ſenſe.

§ 24. But, as our author frequently recurs to this topic, the conſecretion of ſuch words by long uſe, it will be proper to conſider it more narrowly. Some have gone further on this article than our author is willing to juſtify. "Sutor," ſays he*, "pretended, that "it was not more allowable to make new tranſlations "of the Bible, than to change the ſtyle of Cicero into "another. *Nonne injuriam faceret Tullio, qui ejus ſty-"lum immutare vellet?* But, by the leave of this Pariſi-"an theologiſt," ſays Simon, "there is a great differ-"ence between reforming the ſtyle of a book, and ma-"king a verſion of that book. One may make a tran-"ſlation of the New Teſtament from the Greek, or "from the Latin, without making any change on that "Greek or that Latin." The juſtneſs of this ſentiment is ſelf-evident; and it is a neceſſary conſequence from it, that if the words and phraſes in the verſion convey the ſame ideas and thoughts to the readers, which thoſe of the original convey, it is a juſt tranſlation, whatever conformity or diſconformity in ſound and etymology there may be between its words and phraſes, and the words and phraſes of the original, or of other tranſlations.

Of this Simon, appears, on ſeveral occaſions, to be perfectly ſenſible, inſomuch that he has, on this very article, taken up the defence of Caſtalio againſt Beza, who had attacked, with much acrimony, his innovations in point of language. "It is not, as Beza very "well ſaid" (I quote Beza here as quoted by Simon†), "ſo much my opinion, as that of the ableſt eccleſiaſ-"tic writers, who, when they diſcourſe with the great-"eſt elegance concerning ſacred things, make no al-"teration on the paſſages of Scripture which they "quote." Though this verdict of Beza is introduced with manifeſt approbation, *dit-il fort bien*, and though, in confirmation of it, he adds, that both Beza and Caſtalio have taken, in this reſpect, unpardonable liberties, yet it is very ſoon followed by ſuch a cenſure as, in my opinion, invalidates the whole. "There is, nevertheleſs," ſays he‡, "ſome exaggeration in this reproach. "For the queſtion here is about the verſion of the ſa-"cred

* Sutor pretendoit qu'il n'etoit pas plus permis de faire de nouvelles traductions de la Bible, que de changer le ſtile de Ciceron en un autre. *Nonne injuriam faceret Tullio, qui ejus ſtylum immutare vellet?* Mais n'en déplaiſe à ce theologien de Paris, il y a bien de la difference entre reformer le ſtile d'un livre, et faire une verſion de ce même livre. On peut faire une traduction du Nouveau Teſtament ſur le Grec, ou ſur le Latin, ſans toucher à ce Grec, ni à ce Latin. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxi.

† Ce n'eſt pas, dit il fort bien, tant mon ſentiment, que celui des plus habiles ecrivains eccleſiaſtiques, leſquels, quand même ils parlent avec le plus de politeſſe des choſes ſacrées, ne changent rien dans les paſſages de l'Ecriture qu'ils citent. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

‡ Il y a neanmoins de l'exaggeration dans ce reproche. Car il n'eſt ici queſtion que de la verſion des livres ſacrés, et non pas de l'original: et ainſi l'on ne peut pas objecter à Caſtalio, comme fait Beze, d'avoir changé les paroles du Saint Eſprit, ou, comme il parle, *divinam illam Spiritûs Sancti eloquentiam*. Il eſt certain que le Saint Eſprit, pour me ſervir des termes miniſtres

"cred books, and not about the original; ſo that one "cannot object to Caſtalio, as Beza does, his having "changed the words of the Holy Spirit, or, as he ex- "preſſes it, *divinam illam Spiritus Sancti eloquentiam.* "It is certain, to adopt the ſtyle of the miniſters of Ge- "neva, that the Holy Spirit did not ſpeak Latin. "Wherefore, Caſtalio might well put, in his Latin "tranſlation, *lotio* and *genii*, inſtead of *baptiſma* and *an-* "*geli*, without changing aught in the expreſſions of the Holy Spirit." The moderation and juſtneſs of his ſentiments here, do not well accord either with the high claims which, in favour of eccleſiaſtic terms, he makes to conſecration, canonization. &c. or with the accuſations brought, on this very article, againſt Eraſmus and others.

Wherein does the expreſſion of Theodore Beza, in calling thoſe ancient words and phraſes of the Vulgate, *divinam illam ſpiritus Sancti eloquentiam*, differ, in import, from that given by John Bois, who ſays, in reference to them, *Libenter audio Scripturam ſuo quidem modo, ſuoque velut idiomate loquentem?* May it not be replied, juſt as pertinently to Bois as to Beza: "The queſ- "tion here, is about the verſion of the ſacred books, and "not about the original. It is certain, that as the Ho- "ly Spirit did not ſpeak Latin, the Scriptures were not written in that lanugage?" Their phraſes and idioms, therefore, are not concerned in the diſpute; for, if thoſe expreſſions, concerning which we are now inquiring, be not the language of the Holy Spirit, as Simon himſelf maintains that they are not; neither are they the language of the Scriptures. Thus, the ſame ſentiment, with an inconſiderable difference in the expreſſion, is quoted by our author, with high approbation from the canon of Ely, as worthy of being turned into a general rule*, and with no little cenſure from the miniſter of Geneva.

§ 25. I HAVE often had occaſion to ſpeak of the obſcurity of ſuch terms, and I have ſhown† the impropriety of ſeveral of them, as conveying ideas very different from thoſe conveyed by the words of the original, rightly underſtood: and though this alone would be a ſufficient reaſon for ſetting them aſide, ſufficient I mean, to any perſon who makes more account of obtaining the mind of the Spirit, than of acquiring the dialect of uninſpired interpreters; the very reaſon for which the uſe of them is ſo ſtrenuouſly urged by Simon and others, appears to me a very weighty reaſon againſt employing them. They are, ſay theſe critics, conſecrated words; that is in plain language, they are by the uſe of eccleſiaſtical writers, become a ſort of technical terms in theology. This is really the fact. Accordingly, thoſe words hardly enter into common uſe at all. They are appropriated as terms of art, which have no relation to the ordinary commerce of life. Now, nothing can be more repugnant to the character of the diction employed by the ſacred writers; there being, in their language, nothing to which we can apply the words ſcholaſtic or technical. On the contrary, the inſpired penmen always adopted ſuch terms as were in familiar uſe with their readers on the moſt common occurrences. When the Evangeliſt tells us, in Greek‡, that the angel ſaid to the ſhepherds, Ευαγγελιζομαι υμιν, he repreſents him as ſpeaking in as plain terms to all who underſtood Greek, as one who ſays in Engliſh, *I bring you good news*, ſpeaks to thoſe who underſtand Engliſh. But will it be ſaid, that the Latin interpreter ſpoke as plainly to every reader of Latin, when he ſaid, *Evangelizo vobis?* Or does that deſerve to be called a verſion, which conveys neither the matter nor the manner of the author? Not the matter, becauſe an unintelligible word conveys no meaning; not the manner, becauſe what the author ſaid ſimply and familiarly, the tranſlator ſays ſcholaſtically and pedantically. Of this, however, I do not accuſe Jerom. The phraſe in queſtion was doubtleſs one of thoſe which he did not think it prudent to meddle with.

§ 26. NOR will their method of obviating all difficulties by means of the margin, ever ſatisfy a reaſonable perſon. Is it proper, in tranſlating an author, to make a piece of patchwork of the verſion, by tranſlating one word, and miſ-tranſlating, or leaving untranſlated, another, with perpetual references to the margin, for correcting the blunders intentionally committed in the text? And if former tranſlators have, from ſuperſtition, from exceſſive deference to their predeceſſors, from fear of giving offence, or from any other motive, been induced to adopt ſo abſurd a method, ſhall we think ourſelves obliged to imitate them? Some ſeem ſtrangely to imagine, that to have, in the tranſlation, as many as poſſible of the articulate ſounds, the letters and ſyllables of the original, is to be very literal, and, conſequently, very cloſe. If any chuſe to call this literal, I ſhould think it idle to diſpute with him about the word; but I could not help obſerving that, in this way, a verſion may be very literal, and perfectly foreign from the purpoſe. Nobody will queſtion that the Engliſh word *pharmacy* is immediately derived from the Greek φαρμακεια, of which it retains

ſtres de Geneve, n'a point parlé Latin. C'eſt pourquoi Caſtalio a pû mettre dans ſa traduction Latine *lotio* et *genii* au lieu de *baptiſma* et *angeli*, ſans rien changer pour cela dans les expreſſions du Saint Eſprit. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

* Cette reflexion doit ſervir de regle pour une infinité d'endroits du Nouveau Teſtament, ou les nouveaux traducteurs ont affecté de s'eloigner de l'ancienne edition Latine. Ibid. ch. xxii. † Diſſ. IX. throughout. ‡ Luke ii. 10.

retains almoſt all the letters. Ought we, for that reaſon, to render the Greek word φαρμακεια, *pharmacy*, in the catalogue the apoſtle has given us of the works of the fleſh*? Muſt we render παροξυσμος† *paroxyſm*, and παραδοξα‡ *paradoxes*? *Idiot* is, by this rule, a literal verſion of the Greek ιδιωτης. But an interpreter would be thought not much above that character, who ſhould render it ſo in ſeveral places of Scripture§. Yet, if this be not exhibiting what Beza denominates *divinum illam Spiritûs Sancti eloquentiam*; or what Bois, with no better reaſon, calls *Scripturam ſuo quidem modo, ſuoque velut idiomate loquentem*, it will not be eaſy to aſſign an intelligible meaning to theſe phraſes.

But, if ſuch be the proper exhibition of the eloquence of the Spirit, and of the idiom of Scripture, it will naturally occur to aſk, Why have we ſo little, even in the Vulgate, of this divine eloquence? Why do we ſo ſeldom hear the Scripture, even there, ſpeak in its own way and in its native idiom? It would have been eaſy to mutilate all, or moſt of the Greek words, forming them in the ſame manner as *evangelizatus* and *ſcandalizatus* are formed, and ſo turn the whole into a gibberiſh that would have been neither Greek nor Latin, though it might have had ſomething of the articulation of the one language, and of the ſtructure of the other. But it is an abuſe of ſpeech, to call a jargon of words, wherein we have nothing but a reſemblance in ſound, without ſenſe, the eloquence of the Holy Spirit, or the idiom of the Scriptures.

It is ſometimes made the pretence for retaining the original word, that it has different ſignifications, and, therefore, an interpreter, by preferring one of theſe, is in danger of hurting the ſenſe. Thus, the Rhemiſh tranſlators, who render αλλον παρακλητον δωσει υμιν‖, *He will give you another paraclete*, ſubjoin this note: "*Paraclete*, by interpretation, is either a com-" forter, or an advocate; and, therefore, to tranſlate " it by any one of them only, is, perhaps, to abridge " the ſenſe of this place:" to which Fulke, who publiſhes their New Teſtament along with the then common verſion, anſwers very pertinently, in the note immediately following: "If you will not tranſlate any " words that have diverſe ſighifications, you muſt " leave five hundred more untranſlated than you have " done." But there is not even this poor pretence for all the conſecrated barbariſms. The verb ευαγγελιζομαι never occurs in the Goſpel in any ſenſe but one, a ſenſe eaſily expreſſed in the language of every people.

§ 27. IT may be replied, 'if you will not admit with 'Beza, that this mode of writing is the eloquence of 'the Spirit, or with Bois, that it is the idiom of Scripture, you muſt at leaſt allow, with Melancthon, that 'that it is the language and ſtyle of the church: *Nos loquamur cum eccleſia. Ne pudeat nos materni ſermonis. 'Eccleſia eſt mater noſtra. Sic autem loquiter eccleſia'*. This comes indeed nearer the point in hand. The language of the Latin church is, in many things, founded in the ſtyle introduced by the ancient interpreters. But it ought to be remembered, that even the Latin church herſelf does not preſent thoſe interpreters to us as infallible, or affirm that their language is irreprehenſible. And if ſhe herſelf has been any how induced to adopt a ſtyle that is not well calculated for conveying the mind of the Lord; nay, which in many things darkens, and in ſome miſrepreſents it, ſhall we make leſs account of communicating clearly the truths revealed by the Spirit, than of perpetuating a phraſeology which contributes to the advancement of ignorance, and of an implicit deference in ſpiritual matters to human authority? On the contrary, if the church has, in proceſs of time, contracted ſomewhat of a Babyloniſh dialect, and thereby loſt a great deal of her primitive ſimplicity, purity, and plainneſs of manner; her language cannot be too ſoon cleared of the unnatural mixture, and we cannot too ſoon reſume her native idiom. To act thus is ſo far from being imputable to the love of novelty, that it reſults from that veneration of antiquity which leads men to aſk for the old paths, and makes the votaries of the true religion deſirous to return to the undiſguiſed ſentiments, manner, and ſtyle, of holy writ, which are evidently more ancient than the oldeſt of thoſe canonized corruptions. This is not to relinquiſh, it is to reſtore the true idiom of Scripture: with as little propriety is ſuch a truly primitive manner charged with the want of ſimplicity. A technical or learned ſtyle is of all ſtyles the leaſt entitled to be called *ſimple*; for it is the leaſt fitted for conveying inſtruction to the ſimple, to *babes* in knowledge, the character by which thoſe to whom the Goſpel was firſt publiſhed, were particularly diſtinguiſhed¶. Whereas the tendency of a ſcholaſtic phraſeology, is, on the contrary, to hide divine things from babes and ſimple perſons, and to reveal them only to ſages and ſcholars. Never, therefore, was controverſiſt more unlucky in his choice of arguments than our opponents on this article are in urging the plea of ſimplicity and that of Scripture idiom, topics manifeſtly ſubverſive of their cauſe.

§ 28. THE impropriety of changing, on any pretext, the conſecrated terms, and the impropriety of giving to the people within the pale of the Roman church, any tranſlation of Scripture into their mother-tongue, unleſs from the Vulgate, are topics to which Father Simon

* Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. † Acts xv. 39. ‡ Luke v. 26. § Acts iv. 13. 1 Cor. xiv, 16, 23, 24. 2 Cor. xi. 6. ‖ John xiv. 16. ¶ Matth. xi. 25. Luke x. 21.

Simon frequently recurs. And it must be acknowledged that, on his hypothesis, which puts the authority of tradition on the same foot with that of scripture, and makes the church the depository and interpreter of both, there appears a suitableness in his doctrine. He admits, however, that the translation she has adopted, is not entirely exempted from errors, though free from such as affect the articles of faith, or rules of practice. The propriety of translating only from the Vulgate, he maintains from this single consideration, its being that which is read for Scripture daily in their churches.

Now this argument is of no weight with Protestants, and appears not to be entitled to much weight even with Roman Catholics. If there be no impropriety in their being supplied with an exact version of what is read in their chuches; neither is there any impropriety in their being supplied with an exact version of what was written by the inspired penmen, for the instruction of the first Christians. This appears as reasonable and as laudable an object of curiosity even to Romanists as the other. Nay, I should think this, even on Simon's own principles, defensible. The sacred penmen were infallible, so was not the ancient interpreter. He will reply, 'But ye have not the very 'hand-writing of the Apostles and Evangelists. There 'are different readings in different Greek copies. Ye 'are not, therefore, absolutely certain of the conformity of your Greek in every thing, any more than 'we are of our Latin to those original writings.' This we admit, but still insist that there is a difference. The Latin has been equally exposed with the Greek to the blunders of transcribers. And as, in some things, different Greek copies read differently, we receive that version, with other ancient translations, to assist us in doubtful cases to discover the true reading. But the Vulgate, with every other version, labours under this additional disadvantage, that, along with the errors arising from the blunders of copiers, it has those also arising from the mistakes of the interpreter.

§ 29. But, in fact, the secret reason both for preserving the consecrated terms, and for translating only from the Vulgate, is no other than to avoid, as much as possible, whatever might suggest to the people, that the Spirit says one thing and the Church another. It is not according to the true principles of ecclesiastical policy, that such differences should be exposed to the vulgar. This the true sons of the church have discovered long ago. "Gardiner," says bishop Burnet*, "had a singular conceit. He fancied there were "many words in the New Testament of such majesty "that they were not to be translated, but must stand "in the English Bible as they were in the Latin. A "hundred of these he put into a writing, which was "read in convocation. His design in this was visible, "that if a translation must be made, it should be so "daubed all through with Latin words, that the peo"ple should not understand it much the better for its "being English. A taste of this the reader may have "by the first twenty of them; *ecclesia, pœnitentia, pon*"*tifex, ancilla, contritus, olocausta, justitia, justificatio,* "*idiota, elementa, baptizare, martyr, adorare, sandali*"*um, simplex, tretrarcha, sacramentum, simulacrum, glo*"*ria.* The design he had of keeping some of these, "particularly the last save one, is plain enough, that "the people might not discover that visible opposition "which was between the Scriptures and the Roman "church, in the matter of images. This could not "be better palliated, than by disguising these places "with words that the people understood not." Thus far the bishop.

§ 30. It would not be easy to conjecture why Gardiner, that zealous opposer of the reformation, selected some of the words above mentioned as proper to be retained, unless by their number and frequent recurrence, to give an uncouth and exotic appearance to the whole translation. In regard to others of them, as the bishop justly remarks, the reason is obvious. And it is to be regretted that that historian has not inserted in his valuable work the whole catalogue. Nothing could serve better to expose the latent but genuine purpose of the consecrated terms. Not that any judicious person can be at a loss to discover it; but the more numerous the examples are, the evidence is the stronger. The meaning of common words is learned solely from common usage, but the import of canonized words can be got only from canonical usage. We all know what an *image* is, it being a word in familiar use; we therefore find no difficulty in discovering what we are forbidden to worship by the command which forbids the worship of images. Whereas, had the word *simulacrum*, quite unused before, been substituted for image, it would have doubtless, acquired a currency on theological subjects; but being confined to these, would have been no better than a technical term in theology, for the meaning of which, recourse must be had to men of the profession. Nor would it have required of the casuist any metaphysical acuteness in distinguishing, to satisfy those whom he taught to worship *images*, that they were in no danger of adoring a *simulacrum*.

§ 31. To prevent mistakes, it may not be improper to observe, that the word *simulacrum* in the Vulgate itself is no more a term of art than *similitudo* or *imago* are; for they are all words in familiar use in Latin; but

2

* History of the Reformation in England, book iii. year 1542.

but *ſimulacrum* is not in familiar uſe in Engliſh, though *ſimilitude* and *image* are, which are formed both from Latin words of the ſame ſignification. It is not, therefore, their affinity, or even identity in reſpect of ſound, but their difference in reſpect of uſe, which ſtamps nearly related words, or what we call convertible terms, with theſe different characters, in different languages. Thus ευαγγελιζω and σκανδαλιζω are common, not technical terms in the Greek New Teſtament: but *evangelizo* and *ſcandalizo* in the Vulgate are the reverſe, technical not common. Now it is for this reaſon, I ſay, that to adopt without neceſſity, ſuch terms in a language to which they do not belong, and in which conſequently they are unknown, or known merely as profeſſional terms, is to form a ſtyle the very reverſe of what I ſhould call the eloquence of the Holy Spirit, and the proper idiom of the Scriptures. For a greater contraſt to the plain and familiar idiom of Scripture, and the eloquence of the Spirit, addreſſed entirely to the people, than a ſtyle that is juſtly denominated dark, learned, and technical, it is impoſſible to conceive.

Let it be obſerved, therefore, that it is the uſe, not the etymology, to which, in tranſlating, we ought to have reſpect, either in adopting, or in rejecting an expreſſion. A word is neither the better nor the worſe for its being of Greek or Latin origin. But our firſt care ought to be, that it convey the ſame meaning with the original term; the ſecond, that it convey it as nearly as poſſible in the ſame manner, that is, with the ſame plainneſs, ſimplicity, and perſpicuity. If this can be done with equal advantage by terms which have obtained the ſanction of eccleſiaſtic uſe, ſuch terms ought to be preferred. For this reaſon I prefer *juſt* to virtuous, *redeemer* to ranſomer, *ſaviour* to deliverer. But if the ſame meaning be not conveyed by them, or not conveyed in the ſame manner, they ought to be rejected. Otherwiſe the real dictates of the Spirit and the unadulterated idiom of Scripture, are ſacrificed to the ſhadowy reſemblance, in ſound and etymology, of technical words and ſcholaſtic phraſes.

§ 32. SUCH, upon the whole, are my ſentiments of the regard which, in tranſlating holy writ into modern languages, is due to the practice of former tranſlators, eſpecially of the authors of the Latin Vulgate. And ſuch, in particular, is my notion of thoſe words which, by ſome critics, are called *conſecrated*, and which, in general, in reſpect of the ſenſe, will not be found the moſt eligible; nay, by the uſe of which, there is greater hazard of deſerting that plainneſs and that ſimplicity which are the beſt characteriſtics of the Scripture ſtyle than by any other means I know.

PART II.

The Regard due to the Engliſh Tranſlation.

HAVING been ſo particular in the diſcuſſion of the firſt part of this inquiry, namely, the regard which, in tranſlating the Scriptures, is due to the manner wherein the words and phraſes have been rendered by the authors of the Vulgate, it will not be neceſſary to enter ſo minutely into the ſecond part, concerning the regard which an Engliſh tranſlator owes to the expreſſions adopted in the common tranſlation. The reaſons for adopting, or for rejecting, many of them are ſo nearly the ſame in both caſes, that, to avoid prolixity by unneceſſary repetitions, I ſhall confine myſelf to a few obſervations which the ſpecial circumſtances affecting the common Engliſh verſion naturally give riſe to.

§ 2. THAT tranſlation, we all know, was made at a time when the ſtudy of the original languages, which had been long neglected, was juſt revived in Europe. To this the invention of printing firſt, and the reformation ſoon afterwards, had greatly contributed. As it grew to be a received doctrine among Proteſtants, that the word of God contained in the Scriptures, is the ſole infallible rule which he has given us of faith and manners; the ineffable importance of the ſtudy of Scripture was perceived more and more every day. New tranſlations were made, firſt into Latin, the common language of the learned, and afterwards into moſt European tongues. The ſtudy of the languages naturally introduces the ſtudy of criticiſm, I mean that branch of criticiſm which has language for its object; and which is, in effect, no other than the utmoſt improvement of the grammatical art. But this, it muſt be acknowledged, was not then arrived at that perfection which, in

conſequence of the labours of many learned and ingenious men, of different parties and profeſſions, it has reached ſince. What greatly retarded the progreſs of this ſtudy in the firſt age of the reformation, was the inceſſant diſputes in which the reformers were engaged, about articles of doctrine, eccleſiaſtical polity, and ceremonies, both with the Romaniſts, and among themſelves. This led them inſenſibly to recur to the weapons which had been employed againſt them, and of which they had at firſt ſpoken very contemptuouſly, the metaphyſical and unintelligible ſubtleties of ſchool-divinity.

This recourſe was productive of two bad conſequences. Firſt, it diverted them from the critical ſtudy of the ſacred languages, the ſureſt human means for diſcovering the mind of the Spirit: ſecondly, it infuſed into the heads of the diſputants, prepoſſeſſions in favour of ſuch particular words and phraſes as are adapted to the dialect and ſyſtem of the parties to which they ſeverally attached themſelves; and in prejudice of thoſe words and phraſes which ſeem more ſuitable to the ſtyle and ſentiments of their adverſaries. There is, perhaps, but too good reaſon for adding, an evil conſequence produced alſo upon the heart, in kindling wrath and quenching charity. It was when matters were in this ſituation, that ſeveral of the tranſlations were made. Men's minds were then too much heated with their polemic ſquabbles, to be capable of that impartial, candid, and diſpaſſionate examination, which is ſo neceſſary in thoſe who would approve themſelves faithful interpreters of the oracles of God. Of an undue bias on the judgment in tranſlating, in conſequence of ſuch perpetual wranglings, I have given ſome ſpecimens in a former Diſſertation *.

§ 3. In regard to the common tranſlation, though not entirely exempted from the influence of party and example, as I formerly had occaſion to ſhow †, it is, upon the whole, one of the beſt of thoſe compoſed ſo ſoon after the Reformation. I may ſay juſtly that, if it had not been for an immoderate attachment, in its authors, to the Geneveſe tranſlators, Junius, Tremellius, and Beza, it had been ſtill better than it is; for the greateſt faults with which it is chargeable, are derived from this ſource. But ſince that time, it muſt be owned, things are greatly altered in the church. The rage of diſputation on points rather curious than edifying, or, as the Apoſtle calls it ‡, the dotage about queſtions and ſtrifes of words, has, at leaſt among men of talents and erudition, in a great meaſure ſubſided. The reign of ſcholaſtic ſophiſtry and altercation is pretty well over. Now, when to this reflection we add a proper attention to the great acquiſitions in literature which have of late been made, in reſpect not only of languages, but alſo of antiquities and criticiſm, it cannot be thought derogatory from the merit and abilities of thoſe worthy men who formerly beſtowed their time and labour on that important work, to ſuppoſe that many miſtakes, which were then inevitable, we are now in a condition to correct.

To effect this, is the firſt, and ought, doubtleſs, to be the principal, motive for attempting another verſion. Whatever is diſcovered to be the ſenſe of the Spirit, ſpeaking in the Scriptures, ought to be regarded by us as of the greateſt conſequence: nor will any judicious perſon, who has not been accuſtomed to conſider religion in a political light, as a mere engine of ſtate, deny that where the truth appears, in any inſtance, to have been either miſrepreſented, or but obſcurely repreſented in a former verſion, the fault ought, in an attempt like the preſent, as far as poſſible, to be corrected. To ſay the contrary, is to make the honourable diſtinction of being inſtruments in promoting the knowledge of God of leſs moment, than paying a vain compliment to former tranſlators, or, perhaps, ſhowing an immoderate deference to popular humour, which is always attached to cuſtomary phraſes, whether they convey the true meaning, or a falſe meaning, or any meaning at all. This, therefore, is unqueſtionably a good ground for varying from thoſe who preceded us.

§ 4. It deſerves further to be remarked that, from the changes incident to all languages, it ſometimes happens that words, which expreſſed the true ſenſe at the time when a traſlation was made, come afterwards to expreſs a different ſenſe; in conſequence whereof, though thoſe terms were once a proper verſion of the words in the original, they are not ſo after ſuch an alteration, having acquired a meaning different from that which they had formerly. In this caſe, it cannot be doubted, that in a new tranſlation, ſuch terms ought to be changed. I hinted before §, that I look upon this as having beeu the caſe with ſome of the expreſſions employed in the Vulgate. They conveyed the meaning at the time that verſion was made, but do not ſo now. I ſhall inſtance only in two. The phraſe *pœnetentiam agite* was, in Jerom's time, nearly equivalent in ſignification to the Greek μετανοειτε. It is not ſo at preſent. In conſequence of the uſages which have crept in, and obtained an eſtabliſhment in the churches ſubject to Rome, it no longer conveys the ſame idea; for having become merely an eccleſiaſtic term, its acceptation is regulated only by eccleſiaſtic uſe. Now, in that uſe, it exactly correſponds to

* Diſſ. X. Part V. § 4, &c. † Ibid. ‡ 1 Tim. vi. 4. § Part III. § 9.

to the Engliſh words *do penance*; by which, indeed, the Rhemiſh tranſlators, who tranſlate from the Vulgate, have rendered it in their New Teſtament. Now, as no perſon of common ſenſe, who underſtands the language, will pretend, that to enjoin us to *do penance*, and to enjoin us to *reform*, or *repent*, is to enjoin the ſame thing; both Eraſmus and Beza were excuſable, notwithſtanding the cenſure pronounced by Bois and Simon, in deſerting the Vulgate in this place, and employing the unambiguous term *reſipiſcite*, in preference to a phraſe, now at leaſt become ſo equivocal as *pœnitentiam agite*. We may warrantably ſay more, and affirm, that they would not have acted the part of faithful tranſlators, if they had done otherwiſe.

It was, to appearance, the uniform object of the prieſt of the Oratory (I know not what may have biaſſed the canon of Ely), to put honour upon the church, by which he meant the church of Rome; to reſpect, above all things, and at all hazards, her dogmas, her uſages, her ceremonies, her very words and phraſes. The object of Chriſtian interpreters is, above all things, and at all hazards, to convey, as perſpicuouſly as they can, the truths of the Spirit. If the former ought to be the principal object of the tranſlators of holy writ, Simon was undoubtedly in the right; if the latter, he was undoubtedly in the wrong. The other expreſſion in the Vulgate, which may not improbably have been proper at the time when that tranſlation was made, though not at preſent, is *ſacramentum* for μυστηριον, in the ſecond ſcriptural ſenſe which I obſerved to be ſometimes given to the Greek word*. But, in conſequence of the alterations which have ſince taken place in eccleſiaſtical uſe, the Latin term has acquired a meaning totally different, and is therefore now no ſuitable expreſſion of the ſenſe.

§ 5. Now, what has been obſerved of the Latin words abovementioned, has already happened to ſeveral words employed in the common Engliſh tranſlation. Though this may appear, at firſt, extraordinary, as it is not yet two centuries ſince that verſion was made; it is, nevertheleſs, unqueſtionable. The number of changes whereby a living language is affected in particular periods, is not always in proportion to the extent of time. It depends on the ſtage of advancement, in which the language happens to be during the period, more than on the length of the period. The Engliſh tongue, and the French too, if I miſtake not, have undergone a much greater change than the Italian, in the laſt three hundred years; and perhaps as great as the Greek underwent, from the time of Homer to that of Plutarch, which was more than four times as long. It is not merely the number of writings in any language, but it is rather their merit and eminence, which confers ſtability on its words, phraſes, and idioms.

Certain it is, that there is a conſiderable change in our own ſince the time mentioned; a change in reſpect of the conſtruction, as well as of the ſignifications of words. In ſome caſes, we combine the words differently from the way in which they were combined at the time above referred to: we have acquired many words which were not uſed then, and many then in uſe are now either obſolete, or uſed in a different ſenſe. Theſe changes I ſhall here briefly exemplify. As habit is apt to miſlead us, and we are little diſpoſed to ſuſpect that that meaning of a word or phraſe, to which we are familiariſed, was not always the meaning; to give ſome examples of ſuch alterations, may prevent us from raſhly accuſing former tranſlators, for improprieties wherewith they are not chargeable; and to ſpecify alterations on our own language, may ſerve to remove the doubts of thoſe who imagine there is an improbability in what I have formerly maintained concerning the variations which ſeveral words in ancient languages, have undergone in different periods. Now, this is a point of ſo great moment to the literary critic and antiquary, that it is impoſſible thoroughly to underſtand, or accurately to interpret, ancient authors, without paying due regard to it. Through want of this regard, many things in eccleſiaſtic hiſtory have been much miſunderſtood, and groſsly miſrepreſented. Unluckily, on this ſubject, powerful ſecular motives interfering, have ſeduced men to contribute to the general deception, and to explain ancient names by uſages and opinions comparatively modern. But this by the way; I proceed to the examples.

§ 6. I INTEND to conſider, firſt, the inſtances affected by the laſt of the circumſtances abovementioned, namely, thoſe wherein the ſignification is changed, though the term itſelf remains. Of ſuch I ſhall now produce ſome examples; firſt, in nouns: The word *converſation*, which means no more, at preſent, than *familiar diſcourſe* of two or more perſons, did at the time when the Bible was tranſlated, denote *behaviour* in the largeſt acceptation. The Latin word *converſatio*, which is that generally uſed in the Vulgate, anſwering to the Greek αναστροφη, has commonly this meaning. But the Engliſh word has never, as far as I have obſerved, this acceptation in the preſent uſe, except in the law phraſe *criminal converſation*. And I have reaſon to believe that, in

* Diſſertation IX. Part I. § 7.

the New Teſtament, it is univerſally miſtaken by the unlearned, as ſignifying no more than familiar talk or diſcourſe. Hence it has alſo happenned, that hypocrites and fanatics, have thought themſelves authoriſed, by the words of Scripture, in placing almoſt the whole of practical religion in this alone. Yet I do not remember that the word occurs, ſo much as once, in Scripture in this ſenſe. What we call *converſation* muſt, indeed, be conſidered as included, becauſe it is a very important part of behaviour; but it is not to be underſtood as particularly ſpecified. In one paſſage, it is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from familiar diſcourſe or converſation, in the modern import of the word. Τυπος γινου των πιστων εν λογω, εν αναστροφη, rendered in the common verſion, "Be an example of the believers *in word, in converſation.*(a)" That theſe words λογω and αναστροφη, are not ſynonymous, the repeating of the prepoſition ſufficiently ſhows. Though, therefore, not improperly rendered at that time, when the Engliſh term was uſed in a greater latitude of ſignification, they ought, manifeſtly, to be rendered now, *in converſation, in behaviour;* the firſt anſwering to λογος, the ſecond to αναστροφη.

Another inſtance of ſuch a variation we have in the word *thief*, which, in the language of Scripture, is confounded with *robber*, and probably was ſo alſo, in common language at that time, but is now invariably diſtinguiſhed. They are always carefully diſtinguiſhed in the original, the former being κλεπτης, the latter λῃστης. The two criminals who were crucified with our Lord, are always called, by the two Evangeliſts who ſpecify their crime, λῃσται,(b) never κλεπται. Yet our tranſlators have always rendered it *thieves*, never *robbers*. This is the more remarkable, as what we now call *theft*, was not a capital crime among the Jews. Yet the penitent malefactor confeſſed upon the croſs, that he and his companion ſuffered *juſtly*, receiving *the due reward of their deeds.*(c) He probably would not have expreſſed himſelf in this manner, if their condemnation had not been warranted by the law of Moſes. And though, doubtleſs, the Engliſh word, at that time, was uſed with greater latitude than it is at preſent; yet, as they had rendered the ſame original term λῃστης, when applied to Barabbas, *robber*,(d) they ought to have given the ſame interpretation of the word, as applied to the two malefactors, who, on the ſame occaſion were accuſed of the ſame crime. In like manner, in the parable of the compaſſionate Samaritan, the words rendered, *fell among thieves*,(e) are, λῃσταις περιπεσων. Hardly would any perſon now confound the character there repreſented, with that of thieves.

Again, the expreſſion, *the uppermoſt rooms*,(f) does not ſuggeſt to men of this age, the idea of the chief places at table. but that of the apartments of the higheſt ſtory. *The good man of the houſe*,(g) though ſufficiently intelligible, is become too homely (not to ſay ludicrous) a phraſe for the maſter of the family. The word *luſt*(h) is uſed, in the common tranſlation, in an extent which it has not now; ſo alſo is *uſury.*(i) *Worſhip*,(k) for honour, or civil reſpect paid to men, does not ſuit the preſent idiom. The words *lewd* and *lewdneſs*,(l) in the New Teſtament, convey a meaning totally different from that in which they are now conſtantly uſed. The word *pitiful*, with us, never means, as it does in Scripture,(m) in conformity to etymology, compaſſionate, merciful; but always paltry, contemptible. In the following words, alſo, there is a deviation, though not ſo conſiderable, from the ancient import. *Meat*(n) and food are not now ſynonymous terms, neither are *cunning*(o) and ſkilful, *honeſt*(p) and decent, or becoming, *more*(q) and greater, *quick*(r) and living, *faithleſs*(s) and incredulous, *coaſts*(t) and territories, or borders not confined with the ſea.

The like variations have happened in verbs. *To prevent*(u) is hardly ever now uſed in proſe for to go before; *to faint*(x), for to grow faint, to fail in ſtrength; *to enſue*,(y) for to purſue; *to provoke*(z) for to excite to what is proper and commendable; *to entreat*,(A) for to treat; and *to learn*, for to teach.(B) Even adverbs and particles have ſhared the general fate. *Yea* and *nay*,(C) though ſtill words in the language, are not the expreſſions of affirmation and negation as formerly; *inſtantly*(D) we never uſe for earneſtly, nor *hitherto*(E) for thus far. Yet this was, no doubt, its original meaning, and is more conformable to etymology than the preſent

(a) Tim. iv. 12.
(b) Mat. xxvii. 38. 44. Mark xv. 27.
(c) Luke xxiii. 41.
(d) John xviii 40.
(e) Luke x. 30.
(f) Matth. xxii. 6.
(g) Matth. xx 11.
(h) Rom. vii. 7.
(i) Matth. xxv. 27. Luke xix. 23.
(k) Luke xiv. 10.
(l) See an excellent illuſtration of the remark, in regard to theſe two words, in the Diſquiſitions concerning the Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church, p. 4. note.
(m) James v. 11.
(n) Matth. iii. 4.
(o) Exod. xxxviii. 23.
(p) 2 Cor. viii. 21.
(q) Acts xix. 32.
(r) Acts x. 42.
(s) John xx. 27.
(t) Matth. ii. 16.
(u) 1 Theſſ. iv. 15.
(x) Matth. xv. 32. Luke xviii. 1.
(y) 1 Pet. iii. 11.
(z) Heb. x. 24.
(A) Luke xx. 11.
(B) Pſalm xxv. 4. Common Prayer.
(C) Matth. v. 37.
(D) Luke vii. 4.
(E) Job. xxxviii. 11.

ſent meaning; *hither* being an adverb of place and not of time. More inſtances might be given, if neceſſary.

Now to employ words which, though ſtill remaining in the language, have not the ſanction of preſent uſe for the ſenſe aſſigned to them, cannot fail to render the paſſages where they occur, almoſt always obſcure, and ſometimes ambiguous. But, as every thing which may either miſlead the reader, or darken the meaning, ought carefully to be avoided by the interpreter, no example, however reſpectable, will, in ſuch things, authorize our imitation. An alteration here implies nothing to the diſadvantage of preceding tranſlators, unleſs it can be ſuppoſed to detract from them, that they did not foreſee the changes which in after-times would come upon the language. They employed the words according to the uſage which prevailed in their time. The ſame reaſon, which made them adopt thoſe words then, to wit, regard to perſpicuity by conforming to preſent uſe, would, if they were now alive, and reviſing their own work, induce them to ſubſtitute others in their place.

§ 7. ANOTHER caſe in which a tranſlator ought not implicitly to follow his predeceſſors is in the uſe of words now become obſolete. There is little or no ſcope for this rule, when the ſubject is a verſion into a dead language like the Latin, which, except in the inſtances of ſome eccleſiaſtic terms, ſuch as thoſe above taken notice of, is not liable to be affected by the changes to which a living tongue is continually expoſed. The very notion of a dead language refers us to a period which is paſt, whoſe uſages are now over, and may therefore be conſidered as unchangeable. But in living languages, wherein uſe gradually varies, the greateſt attention ought to be given to what obtains at preſent, on which both propriety and perſpicuity muſt depend. Now, with reſpect to our common verſion, ſome words are diſuſed only in a particular ſignification, others are become obſolete in every meaning. The former ought to be avoided, in ſuch acceptations only as are not now favoured by uſe. The reaſon is obvious; becauſe it is only in ſuch caſes that they ſuggeſt a falſe meaning. The latter ought to be avoided in every caſe wherein they do not clearly ſuggeſt the meaning. I admit that there are certain caſes in which even an obſolete word may clearly ſuggeſt the meaning. For, firſt, the ſenſe of an unuſual or unknown word may be ſo aſcertained by the words in connection, as to leave no doubt concerning its meaning; ſecondly, the frequent occurrence of ſome words in the common tranſlation, and in the Engliſh liturgy, muſt hinder us from conſidering them, though not in common uſe, as unintelligible to perſons acquainted with thoſe books. The danger, therefore, from uſing words now obſolete, but frequently occurring in the Engliſh tranſlation, is not near ſo great as the danger ariſing from employing words not obſolete, in an obſolete meaning, or a meaning which they formerly had, but have not at preſent. For theſe rarely fail to miſlead.

Further, a diſtinction ought to be made in obſolete words, between thoſe which in Scripture occur frequently, and whoſe meaning is generally known, and thoſe which occur but rarely, and may therefore be more readily miſunderſtood. The uſe of old words, when generally underſtood, has, in ſuch a book as the Bible, ſome advantages over newer terms, however appoſite. A verſion of holy writ ought, no doubt, above all things, to be ſimple and perſpicuous; but ſtill it ought to appear, as it really is, the exhibition of a work of a remote age and diſtant country. When, therefore, the terms of a former verſion are, by reaſon of their frequent occurrence there, univerſally underſtood, though no longer current with us, either in converſation or in writing, I ſhould account them preferable to familiar terms. Their antiquity renders them venerable. It adds even an air of credibility to the narative, when we conſider it as relating to the actions, cuſtoms, and opinions of a people very ancient, and in all the reſpects now mentioned, very different from us. There may, therefore, be an exceſs in the familiarity of the ſtyle, though, whilſt we are juſt to the original, there can be no exceſs in ſimplicity and perſpicuity. It is for this reaſon that the interjections *lo* and *behold*, which, though antiquated, are well underſtood, I have retained ſometimes as emphatical, and that the obſolete word *hoſt*, in ſuch phraſes as *the hoſt of heaven*, *the Lord of hoſts*; and that the terms *tribulation*, *damſel*, *publican*, and a few others, are conſidered as of more dignity than *army*, *trouble*, *girl*, *toll-gatherer*; and therefore worthy to be retained. For the like reaſon the term of ſalutation *hail*, though now totally diſuſed, except in poetry, has generally, in the ſacred writings, a much better effect than any modern form which we could put in its place. To theſe we may add words which (though not properly obſolete) are, hardly ever uſed, except when the ſubject, in ſome way or other, concerns religion. Of this kind are the words *ſin*, *godly*, *righteous*, and ſome others, with their derivatives. Such terms, as they are neither obſcure nor ambiguous, are entitled to be preferred to more familiar words. And if the plea for conſecrated words extended no further, I ſhould cheerfully

cheerfully ſubſcribe to it. I cannot agree with Dr. Heylin, who declares explicitly* againſt the laſt mentioned term, though, by his own explanation, it, in many caſes, conveys more exactly the ſenſe of the original, than the word *juſt* which he prefers to it. The practice of tranſlators into other languages, where they are confined by the genius of their language, is of no weight with us. The French have two words, *pouvoir* and *puiſſance;* the Engliſh word *power* anſwers to both. But, becauſe we muſt make one term ſerve for both theirs, will they, in complaiſance to us, think they are obliged to confine themſelves to one? And as to thoſe over-delicate ears, to which, he ſays, cant and fanaticiſm have tarniſhed and debaſed the words *righteous* and *righteouſneſs;* were this conſideration to influence us in the choice of words, we ſhould ſoon find that this would not be the only ſacrifice it would be neceſſary to make. It is but too much the character of the age to nauſeate whatever, in the intercourſe of ſociety, has any thing of a religious or moral appearance, a diſpoſition which will never be ſatisfied, till every thing ſerious and devout be baniſhed, not from the precincts of converſation only, but from the language.

But to return: when words totally unſupported by preſent uſe, occur in Scripture but rarely, they are accompanied with a degree of obſcurity which renders them unfit for a book intended for the inſtruction of all men, the meaneſt not excepted. Of this claſs are the words *leaſing*, for lies; *ravin*, for prey; *bruit*, for rumour; *marvel* for wonder; *worth* for be; *wot*, and *wiſt*, for know and knew; *to bewray*, for to expoſe: *to eſchew*, for to avoid; *to ſkill*, for to be knowing in, or dexterous at; *to wax*, for to become; *to leaſe*, for to loſe; and *to lack*, for to need or be wanting. Terms ſuch as ſome of theſe, like old veſſels, are, I may ſay, ſo buried in ruſt, as to render it difficult to diſcover their uſe. When words become not entirely obſolete, but fall into low or ludicrous uſe, it is then alſo proper to lay them aſide. Thus *folk*, for people; *trow*, for think; *ſeethe*, for boil; *ſod* and *ſodden*, for boiled; *ſcore*, for twenty; *twain*, for two; *clean* and *ſore*, when uſed adverbially, for entirely and very much; *all to*, *albeit*, and *howbeit*, may eaſily be given up. To theſe we may add the words that differ ſo little from thoſe which have ſtill a currency, that it would appear like affectation to prefer them to terms equally proper and more obvious. Of this kind is *mo*, for more; *ſtrait* and *ſtraitly*, for ſtrict and ſtrictly; *dureth*, for endureth; *camp*, for encamp; *miniſh*, for diminiſh; *an hungered*, for hungry; *garner*, for granary; *trump*, for trumpet; *ſith*, for ſince; *fet*, for fetched; *enſample*, for example; *mids*, for midſt. I ſhall only add, that when old words are of low origin, harſh ſound, or difficult pronunciation; or when they appear too much like learned words, familiar terms, if equally appoſite, are more eligible. For this reaſon, the nouns *backſlidings*, *ſhamefacedneſs*, *jeopardy*, and *concupiſcence*, may be well diſpenſed with.

Upon the whole, there is ſtill ſome danger in retaining words which are become obſolete, though they continue to be intelligible. Words hardly ſooner contract the appearance of antiquity, by being abandoned by good uſe, than they are picked up as lawful prize by writers in burleſque, who, by means of them, often add much poignancy to their writings. This proſtitution, when frequent, produces an aſſociation in the mindsof readers, the reverſe of that which originally accompanied them. Hence it is that, though nothing is better ſuited to the ſeriouſneſs and importance of the ſubject of holy writ, than ſolemnity of ſtyle; nothing is, at the ſame time, more hazardous, as no ſpecies of diction borders on the ludicrous more than the ſolemn. Let it ſuffice, therefore, if, without venturing far from the ſtyle of converſation, in queſt of a more dignified elocution, we can unite gravity with ſimplicity and purity, which commonly ſecure perſpicuity. With theſe qualities there can be no material defect in the expreſſion. The ſprightly, the animated, the nervous, would not in ſuch a work, be beauties, but blemiſhes. They would look too much like meretricious ornaments, when compared with the artleſs, the free, yet unaſſuming, manner of the ſacred writers.

§ 8. But if it be of conſequence to avoid antiquated words, it is not leſs ſo to avoid antiquated phraſes, and an antiquated conſtruction. No writing in our language, as far as I know, is leſs chargeable with idiomatical phraſes, vulgariſms, or any peculiarities of expreſſion, than the common tranſlation of the Bible; and to this it is, in a great meaſure, imputable, that the diction remains ſtill ſo perſpicuous, and that it is univerſally accounted ſuperior to that of any other Engliſh book of the ſame period. But though remarkably pure in reſpect to ſtyle, we cannot ſuppoſe that no idiomatical phraſes ſhould have eſcaped the tranſlators, eſpecially when we conſider the frequency of ſuch phraſes in the writings of their contemporaries. Yet, in all the four Goſpels, I recollect only two or three which come under that denomination. Theſe are the *good-man of the houſe*, *they*

* Theol. Lect. vol. i, p. 7.

they laughed him to ſcorn, and *they caſt the ſame in his teeth;* expreſſions for which the interpreters had not the apology that may be pleaded in defence of ſome idioms in the Old Teſtament hiſtory, that they are literal tranſlations from the original*. That the Engliſh conſtruction has undergone ſeveral alterations ſince the Eſtabliſhment of the Proteſtant religion in England, it would be eaſy to evince. Some verbs often then uſed impersonally, and ſome reciprocally, are hardly ever ſo uſed at preſent. *It pitieth them*†, would never be ſaid now. *It repented him*‡, may poſſibly be found in modern language, but never *he repented himſelf*§. There is a difference alſo in the uſe of the prepoſitions. *In*‖ was then ſometimes uſed for *upon*, and *unto* inſtead of *for*¶. *Of* was frequently uſed before the cauſe or the inſtrument, where we now invariably uſe *by***; *of* was alſo employed in certain caſes where preſent uſe requires *off* or *from*††. Like differences might be obſerved in the pronouns. One thing is certain, that the old uſages in conſtruction, oftener occaſioned ambiguity than the preſent, which is an additional reaſon for preferring the latter.

§ 9. FINALLY, in regard to what may be called *technical*, or, in Simon's phraſe, *conſecrated* terms, our tranſlators, though not entirely free from ſuch, have been comparatively ſparing of them. In this they have acted judiciouſly. A a technical ſtyle is a learned ſtyle. That of the Scriptures, eſpecially of the hiſtorical part, is the reverſe; it is plain and familiar. If we except a few terms ſuch as *angel*, *apoſtle*, *baptiſm*, *hereſy*, *myſtery*, which, after the example of other Weſtern churches, the Engliſh have adopted from the Vulgate; and for adopting ſome of which, as has been obſerved, good reaſons might be offered; the inſtances are but few wherein the common name has been rejected, in preference to a learned and peculiar term.

Nay, ſome learned terms, which have been admitted into the liturgy, at leaſt into the rubric, the interpreters have not thought proper to introduce into the Scriptures. Thus, the words, *the nativity*, for Chriſt's birth, *advent*, for his coming, *epiphany*, for his manifeſtations to the Magians by the ſtar, do very well in the titles of the ſeveral diviſions in the Book of Common Prayer, being there a ſort of proper names for denoting the whole circumſtanciated event, or rather the times deſtined for the celebration of the feſtivals, and are convenient, as they ſave circumlocution; but would by no means ſuit the ſimple and familiar phraſeology of the ſacred hiſtorians, who never affect uncommon, and eſpecially learned words. Thus, in the titles of the book of Moſes, the Greek names of the Septuagint, *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Deuteronomy*, are not unfitly preſerved in modern tranſlations, and are become the proper names of the books. But where the Greek word *geneſis*, which ſignifies generation, occurs in that ancient verſion of the book ſo named, it would have been, very improper to transfer it into a modern tranſlation, and to ſay, for example, "This is the *geneſis*, of "the heavens and the earth‡‡." In like manner, *Exodus*, which ſignifies departure, anſwers very well as a proper name of the ſecond book, which begins with an account of the departure of the Iſraelites out of Egypt; but it would be downright pedantry to introduce the term *exodus*, *exody*, or *exod* (for in all theſe ſhapes ſome have affected to uſher it into the language), into the body of the hiſtory.

I remember but one paſſage in the New Teſtament, in which our tranſlators have preferred a ſcholaſtic to the vulgar name where both ſignified the ſame thing; ſo that there was no plea from neceſſity. The expreſſion alluded to is, "To whom he ſhowed "himſelf alive after his *paſſion*§§." Paſſion, in ordinary ſpeech, means ſolely a fit of anger, or any violent commotion of the mind. It is only in theological or learned uſe that it means the ſufferings of Chriſt. The Evangeliſt wrote to the people in their own dialect. Beſides, as he wrote for the conviction of infidels, as well as for the inſtruction of believers, it is not natural to ſuppoſe that he would uſe words or phraſes, in a particular acceptation, which could be known only to the latter. His expreſſion, μετα το παθειν αυτον, which is literally, *after his ſuffering*, is plain and unambiguous, and might have been ſaid of any man who had undergone the like fate. Such is conſtantly the way of the ſacred writers; nor is any thing in language more repugnant to their manner, than the uſe of what is called conſecrated words. I admit, at the ſame time, that *poſt paſſionem ſuam*, in the Vulgate, is unexceptionable, becauſe it ſuits the common acceptation of the word *paſſio* in the Latin language. Juſt ſo, the expreſſion *accipiens calicem*, in the Vulgate‖‖, is natural and proper. *Calix* is a common name for cup, and is ſo uſed in ſeveral places of that verſion; whereas, *taking the chalice*, as the Rhemiſh tranſlators render it, preſents us with

* Matth. xx. 11. εγκοδιστοτε. Matth. ix. 24. κατεγελων αυτε. xxvii. 44. Το αυτο ωνειδιζον αυτω.
† Pſal. cii. 14. Commom Prayer.
‡ Geneſis vi 6.
§ Matth. xxvii 3.
‖ Matth. vi. 10.
¶ John xv. 7
** Matth. i. 18.
†† Matth. vii. 16.
‡‡ Gen. ii. 4.
§§ Acts i. 3.
‖‖ Matt. xxvi. 27.

with a technical term not ſtrictly proper, inaſmuch as it ſuggeſts the previous conſecration of the veſſel to a ſpecial purpoſe, by certain ceremonies, an idea not ſuggeſted by either the Greek ποτηριον, or the Latin *calix*. I do not mean, however to controvert the propriety of adopting an unfamiliar word when neceſſary for expreſſing what is of an unfamiliar, or perhaps, ſingular nature. Thus, to denote the change produced on our Saviour's body, when on the mount with the three diſciples, Peter, and the two ſons of Zebedee, a more appoſite word than *transfigured*, could not have been found. The Engliſh word *transformed*, which comes neareſt, and is more familiar than the other, would have expreſſed too much.

§ 10. To conclude, the reaſons which appear ſufficient to juſtify a change of the words and expreſſions of even the moſt reſpectable predeceſſors in the buſineſs of tranſlating, is when there is ground to think, that the meaning of the author can be either more exactly, or more perſpicuouſly rendered; or even when his manner, that is, when the eſſential qualities of his ſtyle, not the ſound or the etymology of his words, can be more adequately repreſented. For, to one or other of theſe three, all the above caſes will be found reducible.

DISSERTATION THE TWELFTH.

An Account of what is attempted in the Tranſlation of the Goſpels, and in the Notes here offered to the Public.

THE things which will be treated in this diſſertation may, for the ſake of order, be claſſed under the five following heads; the firſt comprehends all that concerns the eſſential qualities of the verſion; the ſecond, what relates to the readings (where there is a diverſity of reading in the original) which are here preferred; the third contains a few remarks on the particular dialect of our language employed in this verſion; the fourth, what regards the outward form in which it is exhibited; and the fifth, ſome account of the notes with which it is accompanied.

PART I.

The eſſential Qualities of the Verſion.

THE three principal objects to be attended to, by every tranſlator, were explained in a former Diſſertation*. It is, perhaps, unneceſſary to ſay, that to them I have endeavoured to give a conſtant attention. It is not, however, to be diſſembled, that even thoſe principal objects themſelves ſometimes interfere. And though an order, in reſpect of importance, when they are compared together, has been alſo laid down, which will, in many caſes, determine the preference, it will not always determine it. I may find a word, for example, which hits the ſenſe of the author preciſely, but which, not being in familiar uſe, is obſcure. Though, therefore, in itſelf a juſt expreſſion of the ſentiment, it may not clearly convey the ſentiment to many readers, becauſe they are unacquainted with it. It is, therefore, but ill fitted to repreſent the plain and familiar manner of the ſacred writers, or, indeed, to anſwer the great end of tranſlation, to convey diſtinctly, to the reader, the meaning of the original. Yet there may be a hazard, on the other hand, that a term more perſpicuous, but leſs appoſite, may convey ſomewhat of a different meaning, an error more to be avoided than the other. Recourſe to circumlocution is ſometimes neceſſary; for the terms of no two languages can be always made to correſpond: but, frequent recourſe to this mode of rendering, effaces the native ſimplicity found in the original, and in ſome meaſure diſfigures the work. Though, therefore, in general, an obſcure, is preferable to an unfaithful, tranſlation, there is a degree of preciſion in the correſpondence of the terms, which an interpreter ought to diſpenſe with, rather than involve his verſion in ſuch darkneſs, as will render it uſeleſs to the generality of readers. This ſhows ſufficiently, that no rule will univerſally anſwer the tranſlator's purpoſe; but that he muſt often carefully balance the degrees of perſpicuity on one hand, againſt thoſe of preciſion on the other, and determine, from the circumſtances of the caſe, concerning their comparative importance. I acknowledge that, in ſeveral inſtances, the counterpoiſe may be ſo equal, that the moſt judicious interpreters may be divided in opinion; nay, the ſame

interpreter may hesitate long in forming a decision or even account it a matter of indifference to which side he inclines.

§ 2. I SHALL only say, in general, that, however much a word may be adapted to express the sense, it is a strong objection against the use of it, that it is too fine a word, too learned, or too modern. For, though there should be a suitableness in the import of the term, to the principal idea intended to be conveyed, there is an unsuitableness in the associated or secondary ideas, which never fail to accompany such terms. These tend to fix on the Evangelists the imputation of affecting elegance, depth in literature or science, or, at least, a modish and flowery phraseology, than which nothing can be more repugnant to the genuine character of their style, a style eminently natural, simple, and familiar. The sentiment of *Jacques le Fevre* (*a*), which shows, at once, his good taste and knowledge of the subject, is here entirely apposite: "What many think elegance is, in God's account, inelegance, and painted words."

§ 3. ON the other hand, a bad effect is also produced by words which are too low and vulgar. The danger here is not, indeed, so great, provided there be nothing ludicrous in the expression, which is sometimes the case with terms of this denomination. When things themselves are of a kind which gives few occasions of introducing the mention of them into the conversation of the higher ranks, and still fewer of naming them in books, their names are considered as partaking in the meanness of the use, and of the things signified. But this sort of vulgarity seems not to have been minded by the inspired authors. When there was a just occasion to speak of the thing, they appear never to have been ashamed to employ the name by which it was commonly distinguished. They did not recur, as modern delicacy prompts us to do, to periphrasis, unusual, or figurative expressions, but always adopted such terms as most readily suggested themselves. There is nothing more indelicate than an unseasonable display of delicacy; for which reason, the naked simplicity wherewith the sacred penmen express themselves on particular subjects, has much more modesty in it than the artificial, but transparent, disguises which, on like occasions, would be employed by modern writers (*b*).

A certain correctness of taste, as well as acuteness of discernment, taught a late ingenious author (*c*) to remark this wonderful union of plainness and chastity in the language of the Bible, which a composer of these days, in any European tongue, would in vain attempt to imitate. Yet it is manifest, that it is not to justness of taste, but to purity of mind in the sacred authors, that this happy singularity in their writings ought to be ascribed. This, however, is an evidence that they did not consider it as mean or unbecoming to call low or common things by their common names. But there are other sorts of vulgarisms in language, with which they are never chargeable, the use of such terms as we call cant words, which belong peculiarly to particular professions, or classes of men, and contemptuous or ludicrous expressions, such as are always accompanied with ideas of low mirth and ridicule.

§ 4. OF both the extremes in language abovementioned, I shall give examples from an anonymous English translator in 1729, whose version, upon the whole, is the most exceptionable of all I am acquainted with in any language; and yet it is but doing justice to the author to add, that in rendering some passages, he has been more fortunate than much better translators. For brevity's sake, I shall here only mention the words I think censurable, referring to the margin for the places. Of learned words the following are a specimen: *verbose* (*d*), *loquaciousness* (*e*), *advent* (*f*), *chasm* (*g*), *grumes* (*h*), *sterile* (*i*), *phenomena* (*k*), *consolated* (*l*), *investigate* (*m*), *innate* (*n*), *saliva* (*o*); concerning which, and some others of the same kind, his critical examiner, Mr Twell, says justly,

(*a*) An old French translator who published a version of the Gospels into French in 1523; his words are, "Ce que plusiers estiment elegance, est inelegance et parolle fardée devant Dieu."

(*b*) I can scarcely give a better illustration of this remark than in the correction proposed by Dr. Delany, of the phrase *him that pisseth against the wall*, which occurs sometimes in the Old Testament, and which, he thinks, should be changed into *him that watereth against the wall*. I am surprised that a correction like this should have the approbation of so excellent a writer as the bishop of Waterford. (See the preface to his Version of the Minor Prophets.) To me the latter expression is much more exceptionable than the former. The former may be compared to the simplicity of a savage who goes naked without appearing to know it, or even thinking of clothes; the other is like the awkward and unsuccessful attempt of an European, to hide the nakedness of which, by the very attempt, he shews himself to be both conscious and ashamed. The same offensive idea is suggested by the word which Delany proposes, as is conveyed by the common term; but it is suggested in so affected a manner, as necessarily fixes a reader's attention upon it, and shows it to have been particularly thought of by the writer. Can any critic seriously think that more is necessary in this case than to say, *every male?*

(*c*) Rousseau.
(*d*) Matth. vi. 7.
(*e*) Ibid.
(*f*) xxiv. 27.
(*g*) Luke, xvi. 26.
(*h*) xxii. 44.
(*i*) i. 17.
(*k*) xii. 56.
(*l*) Acts, xv. 32.
(*m*) xvii. 22.
(*n*) Eph iv. 18.
(*o*) John, ix. 6.

juſtly, that they are unintelligible to the ignorant, and offenſive to the knowing. His fine words and faſhionable phraſes, which, on account of their affinity, I ſhall throw together, the following may ſerve to exemplify, *detachment* (*a*), *foot-guards* (*b*), *parade* (*c*), *brigue* (*d*), *chicanery* (*e*). *Zacharias*, we are told (*f*), *vented his divine enthuſiaſm*; that is, when tranſlated into common ſpeech, *prophecied*. A later tranſlator, or rather paraphraſt, is not much happier in his expreſſion, *he was ſeized with a divine afflatus*, here ſpoken of as a diſeaſe. *Zaccheus*, for chief of the publicans, is made *collector-general of the cuſtoms* (*g*). *Simon Magus*, in his hands, becomes *the plenipotentiary of God* (*h*). Jeſus Chriſt is entitled *guarantee of the alliance* (*i*), and the Lord of hoſts, *the lord of the celeſtial militia* (*k*). And, to avoid the flatneſs of plain proſe, he ſometimes gives a poetical turn to the expreſſion. *Before the cock crow*, becomes in his hands, *Before the cock proclaims the day* (*l*).

The foppery of theſe laſt expreſſions is, if poſſible, more unſufferable than the pedantry of the firſt. They are, beſides, ſo far from conveying the ſenſe of the author, that they all, leſs or more, miſrepreſent it. As to low and ludicrous terms, there is ſometimes a greater coincidence in theſe with quaint and modiſh words, than one at firſt would imagine. It would not be eaſy to aſſign a motive for rendering οικοδιοποτης *yeoman* (*m*), but it is ſtill worſe to tranſlate ὁσοι την θαλασσαν εργαζονται *ſupercargoes* (*n*), αρπαξιν *raparees* (*o*), which he explains in the margin to mean *kidnappers*, and μεθυοντων *ſots* (*p*). I am ſurpriſed he has not found a place for *ſharpers*, *gamblers*, and *ſwindlers*, fit company in every ſenſe for his ſots and raparees. Γλωσσοκομον is diſtended into a *bank* (*q*), and κλεπτης dwindles into a *pilferer* (*r*): την χαραν της κυριε σου is degraded into *thy maſter's diverſions* (*s*), and αινος is ſwoln into a *conſort of praiſe* (*t*). The laudable and ſucceſsful importunity of the two blind men who, notwithſtanding the checks they received from the multitude, perſiſted in their application to Jeſus for relief, is contemptuouſly denoted *bawling out* (*u*). When we are told that our Lord *ſilenced*, εφιμωσε, the *ſadducees*, this author acquaints us that he *dumbfounded* them (*x*). In ſhort, what by magnifying, what by diminiſhing, what by diſtorting and diſfiguring, he has, in many places, burleſqued the original. For anſwering this bad purpoſe, the extremes of cant and bombaſt are equally well adapted. The exceſs in the inſtances now given is ſo manifeſt, as entirely to ſuperſede both argument and illuſtration.

§ 5. But in regard to the uſe of what may be called learned words, it muſt be owned after all, that it is not eaſy, in every caſe, to fix the boundaries. We ſometimes find claſſed under that denomination, all the words of Greek and Latin etymology, which are not current among the inferior orders of the people. Yet I acknowledge, that if we were rigidly to exclude all ſuch terms, we ſhould be too often obliged either to adopt circumlocution, or to expreſs the ſentiment weakly and improperly. There are other diſadvantages to be remarked afterwards, which might reſult from the excluſion of every term that may be comprehended in the definition above given. The common tranſlation, if we except the conſecrated terms, as ſome call them, which are not many, is univerſally admitted to be written in a ſtyle that is not only natural, but eaſily underſtood by the people: yet, in the common tranſlation, there are many words which can hardly be ſuppoſed ever to have been quite familiar among the lower ranks. There is, however, one advantage poſſeſſed by that verſion, over every other book compoſed at that period, which is, that from the univerſality of its uſe, and (we may now add) its long continuance, it muſt have greatly contributed to give a currency to thoſe words which are frequently employed in it. Now, it would be abſurd, in an interpreter of this age, to expect a ſimilar effect from any private verſion. A new tranſlation, even though it were authoriſed by the public, would not have the ſame advantage at preſent, when our language is in a more advanced ſtage.

§ 6. I should not be ſurpriſed that a reader not accuſtomed narrowly to attend to theſe matters, were diſpoſed, at firſt hearing, to queſtion the fact, that there are many words in the vulgar tranſlation which were not in common uſe at the time among the lower orders. But I am perſuaded that a little reflection muſt ſoon convince him of it: abſtracting from thoſe terms which have been transferred from the original languages, becauſe there were no correſponding names in our tongue, ſuch as *phylactery*, *tetrarch*, *ſynagogue*, *proſelyte*, *centurion*, *quaternion*, *legion*, there

(*a*) Matth. ii. 16.
(*b*) xxvii. 27.
(*c*) 2 Theſſ. ii. 9.
(*d*) 1 Theſſ. v. 13.
(*e*) 1 Tim. vi. 4.
(*f*) Luke i. 67.
(*g*) xix. 2.
(*h*) Acts, viii. 10.
(*i*) Heb. vii. 22.
(*k*) James, v. 4.
(*l*) Luke, xxii. 34.
(*m*) Matth. xiii. 27.
(*n*) Rev. xviii. 17.
(*o*) 1 Cor. v. 10.
(*p*) Matth. xxiv. 49.
(*q*) John, xii. 6.
(*r*) Ibid.
(*s*) Matth. xxv. 21.
(*t*) xxi. 16.
(*u*) xx. 31.
(*x*) xxii. 34.

are many in the Engliſh Bible, which cannot be conſidered as having been at that time level to the meaneſt capacities. They are ſcarcely ſo yet, notwithſtanding all the advantage which their occurring in that tranſlation has given them. Of ſuch words I ſhall give a pretty large ſpecimen in the margin*. Nor can it be ſaid of thoſe there ſpecified, that more familiar terms could not have been found equally expreſſive. For, though this may be true of ſome of them, it is not true of them all. *Calling* is equivalent to vocation, *comfort* to conſolation, *deſtruction* to perdition, *forgiveneſs* to remiſſion, *defilement* to pollution, *almighty* to omnipotent, *enlightened* to illuminated, *watchful* to vigilant, *delightful* to delectable, *unchangeable* to immutable, *heavenly* to celeſtial, and *earthly* to terreſtrial. Nay, the firſt ſix in the marginal liſt might have been not badly ſupplied by the more homely terms, *writer*, *ſcholar*, *compariſon*, *letter*, *unbeliever*, *womb*. Yet I would not be underſtood by this remark, as intending to throw any blame upon the tranſlators for the choice they have ſometimes made of words, which, though not obſcure, were not the moſt familiar that it was poſſible to find. There are ſeveral reaſons, to be given immediately, which may juſtly determine the tranſlator, on ſome occaſions, to deſert the common rule of adopting always the moſt obvious words. At the ſame time there are certain exceſſes in this way, whereof I have alſo given examples, into which a judicious interpreter will never be in danger of falling. The reaſons which ought, on the other hand, to determine a tranſlator, not to confine himſelf to the words which are current in the familiar tattle of the lower ranks in ſociety, are as follows:

§ 7. FIRST, in all compoſitions not in the form of dialogue, even the ſimpleſt, there is ſome ſuperiority in the ſtyle to the language of converſation among the common people; and even the common people themſelves underſtand many words which, far from having any currency among them, never enter into their ordinary talk. This is particularly the caſe with thoſe of them who have had any ſort of education, were it but the loweſt. One ought, therefore, to conſider accurately the degree of the uncommonneſs of the term, before it be rejected: as it may not be eaſy to ſupply its place with one more familiar and equally appoſite. Unneceſſary circumlocutions are cumberſome, and ought always to be avoided. They are unfriendly alike to ſimplicity and to energy, and ſometimes even to propriety and perſpicuity.

§ 8. SECONDLY, there are caſes wherein ſome things may be done, nay, ought to be done, by a tranſlator for the ſake of variety. I acknowledge that this is a ſubordinate conſideration, and that variety is never to be purchaſed at the expence of either perſpicuity or ſimplicity. But even the ſacred hiſtorians, though eminently ſimple and perſpicuous, do not always confine themſelves to the ſame words in expreſſing the ſame thoughts. Not that there appears in their manner any aim at varying the expreſſion; but, it is well known that, without ſuch an aim, the ſame ſubject, even in converſation, is hardly ever twice ſpoken of preciſely in the ſame words. To a certain degree this is a conſequence of that quality I have had occaſion oftner than once to obſerve in them, a freedom from all ſolicitude about their language. Whereas an unvarying recourſe to the ſame words for expreſſing the ſame thoughts, would, in fact, require one to be ſolicitous about uniformity, and uncommonly attentive to it. But in the uſe of the terms of principal conſequence, in which the aſſociation between the words and the ideas is much ſtronger, they are pretty uniform in recurring to the ſame words, though they are not ſo in matters of little moment. Yet in theſe the variety is no greater than is perfectly natural in men whoſe thoughts are engroſſed by their ſubject, and who never ſearch about in queſt of words. Now it is only in conſequence of ſome attention to language in a tranſlator, that he is capable of doing juſtice to this inattention, if I may ſo denominate it, of his author.

§ 9. Thirdly, it was remarked before†, that though there is a fameneſs of idiom in the writers of the New Teſtament, particularly the Evangeliſts, there is

* *Firſt of nouns:* ſcribe, diſciple, parable, epiſtle, infidel, matrix, lunatic, exile, exorciſt, ſuppliant, reſidue, genealogy, appetite, audience, pollution, perdition, partition, potentate, progenitor, liberality, occurrent, immutability, pre-eminence, remiſſion, diverſity, fragment, abjects, frontier, tradition, importunity, concupiſcence, redemption, interceſſion, ſuperſcription, inquiſition, inſurrection, communion, inſtructor, mediator, exactor, interceſſor, benefactor, malefactor, prognoſticator, ambaſſador, ambaſſage, ambuſhment, meditation, miniſtration, adminiſtration, abomination, conſummation, convocation, conſtellation, conſolation, conſultation, acceptation, communication, diſputation, cogitation, eſtimation, operation, divination, vocation, deſolation, tribulation regeneration, propitiation, juſtification, ſanctification, ſaluration, interpretation, ſupplication, exaction, unction. *Second, of adjectives:* barbed, circumſpect, converſant, extinct, vigilant, inordinate, delectable, tributary, impotent, magnifical, immutable, innumerable, celeſtial, incorruptible, terreſtrial, omnipotent. *Third, of verbs and participles:* laud, diſtil, remit, adjure, implead, eſtimate, aſcend, deſcend, fruſtrate, diſannul, meditate, premeditate, predeſtinate, conſort, amerce, transferred, transfigured, illuminated, conſecrated, tranſlated, incenſed, mollified.

† Diſſ. I. Part II.

is a diverſity in their ſtyles. Hence it ariſes, that different terms are ſometimes employed by the different hiſtorians in relating the ſame fact. But, as this circumſtance has not much engaged the attention of interpreters, it often happens that in the tranſlations of the goſpels (for this is not peculiar to any one tranſlation), there appears in the verſion a greater coincidence in the ſtyle of the Evangeliſts, than is found in the original. Now there are very good reaſons to determine us to avoid, as much as poſſible, a fameneſs which is not authoriſed by the original. There are caſes, I own, in which it is unavoidable. It often happens that two or more words, in the language of the author, are ſynonymous, and may therefore be uſed indiſcriminately for expreſſing the ſame thing, when it is impoſſible to find more than one, in the language of the tranſlator, which can be uſed with propriety. When our lord fed the five thouſand men in the deſert, the order he gave to the people immediately before was, as expreſſed by Matthew (*a*) ανακλιθηναι επι τους χορτους; as expreſſed by Mark (*b*), ανακλιναι επι τω χλωρω χορτω; as expreſſed by Luke (*c*), κατακλινατε αυτους; and, as expreſſed by John (*d*), ποιησατε αναπεσειν. Here every one of the Evangeliſts conveys the ſame order in a different phraſe, all of them, however, both naturally and ſimply. This variety it would be impoſſible to imitate in Engliſh, without recurring to unnatural and affected expreſſions. The three laſt Evangeliſts uſe different verbs to expreſs the poſture, namely ανακλινω, κατακλινω, and αναπιπτω. And even in the firſt, the expreſſion is, I may ſay equally varied, as one of the two who uſe that verb, employs the paſſive voice, the other the active. Now, in the common tranſlation, the phraſe *to ſit down*, ſignifying the poſture, is the ſame in them all. I do not here animadvert on the impropriety of this verſion. I took occaſion formerly (*e*), to obſerve that thoſe Greek words denote always *to lie*, and not *to ſit*. My intention at preſent is only to ſhow that the ſimplicity of the ſacred writers does not entirely exclude variety. Even the three terms abovementioned, are not all that occur in the Goſpels for expreſſing the poſture then uſed at table. Ανακειμαι, and κατακειμαι, are alſo employed. It would be in vain to attempt, in modern tongues, which are comparatively ſcanty, to equal the copiouſneſs of Greek; but, as far as the language which we uſe will permit, we ought not to overlook even theſe little variations.

§ 10. The Evangeliſts have been thought, by many, ſo much to coincide in their narratives, as to give ſcope for ſuſpecting that ſome of thoſe, who wrote more lately, copied thoſe who wrote before them. Though it muſt be owned, that there is often a coincidence, both in matter and in expreſſion, it will not be found ſo great in the original, nor ſo frequent as, perhaps, in all tranſlations ancient and modern. Many tranſlators have conſidered it as a matter of no moment, provided the ſenſe be juſtly rendered, whether the differences in the manner were minded or not. Nay, in certain caſes, wherein it would have been eaſy to attain, in the verſion, all the variety of the original, ſome interpreters ſeem ſtudiouſly to have avoided it. Perhaps they did not judge it convenient to make the appearance of a difference between the ſacred writers in words, when there was none in meaning. In this, however, I think they judged wrong. An agreement in the ſenſe, is all that ought to be deſired in them; more eſpecially, as they wrote in a language different from that ſpoken by the perſons whoſe hiſtory they relate. When this is the caſe, the moſt tenacious memory will not account for a perfect identity of expreſſion in the witneſſes. Their teſtimony is given in Greek. The language ſpoken by thoſe whoſe ſtory they relate, was a dialect of Chaldee. They were themſelves, therefore (at leaſt three of them), the tranſlators of the ſpeeches and converſations recorded in their hiſtories. The utmoſt that is expected from different tranſlators, is a coincidence in ſenſe; a perfect coincidence in words, in a work of ſuch extent as the Goſpel, is, without previous concert, impoſſible. Conſequently, an appearance of difference, ariſing ſolely from the uſe of different expreſſions, is of much leſs prejudice to the credibility of their narration, than the appearance of concert or copying would have been.

When, therefore, the language of the interpreter of the Goſpels will admit an imitation of ſuch diverſities in the ſtyle, it ought not be overlooked. If poſſible, their narratives ſhould be neither more nor leſs coincident in the verſion, than they are in the original. And to this end, namely, that the phraſeology may nearly differ as much in Engliſh as it does in Greek, I have, on ſome occaſions, choſen not the very beſt word which might have been found, ſatisfying myſelf with this, that there is nothing in the word I have employed, unſuitable, dark, or ambiguous. But, as was ſignified before, it is not poſſible ſo to diverſify the ſtyle of a verſion, as to make it always correſpond, in this reſpect, to the original. Nor ought a correſpondence of this kind ever

(*a*) Matth. xiv. 19.
(*b*) Mark, vi. 39.
(*c*) Luke, ix. 14.
(*d*) John, vi. 10.
(*e*) Diſſ. VIII. Part III. § 3, &c.

ever to be attempted, at the expence of either perſpicuity or propriety. I ſhall only add, that a little elevation of ſtyle may naturally be expected in quotations from the prophets and the Pſalms, and in the ſhort canticles which we have in the two firſt chapters of Luke; for in theſe, though not written in verſe, the expreſſion is poetical.

§ 11. FOURTHLY, Not only the differences in the ſtyles of the different Evangeliſts, ought not to paſs entirely unnoticed; but the ſame thing may be affirmed of the changes ſometimes found in the terms uſed by the ſame Evangeliſt. Here, again, I muſt obſerve, that it were in vain to attempt an exact correſpondence in this reſpect. There is a ſuperior richneſs in the language of the ſacred writers, which even their ſtyle, though ſimple and unaffected (for they never ſtep out of their way in queſt of ornament), cannot entirely conceal. They uſe conſiderable variety of terms for expreſſing thoſe ordinary exertions for which our modern tongues hardly admit any variety. I have given one ſpecimen of this, in the words whereby they expreſs the poſture then uſed at meals. I ſhall here add ſome other examples. The following words occur in the New Teſtament, λεγω, επω, φημι, φασκω, φραζω. ρεω, ειρω, ερεω, all anſwering to the Engliſh verb *ſay*. Of theſe we may affirm, with truth, that it is but rarely that any of them admits a different rendering in our language. The words κοπτω, μελιτω, μιαινω, στιλβω, ρυπτω, correſpond to the Engliſh verb *defile*, by which they are commonly rendered. The greater part of the words ſubjoined are, in the common tranſlation, rendered always, and the reſt occaſionally, by the Engliſh verb *ſee*; ειδω, απειδω, οπτομαι, οπτανω, βλεπω, εμβλεπω, ὁραω, καθοραω, θεαομαι, θεωρεω, ισορεω. Yet, in none of the liſts afore-mentioned, are the words perfectly ſynonymous, nor can they be ſaid to be always uſed promiſcuouſly by the inſpired penmen. They are, conſequently, of uſe, not only for diverſifying the ſtyle, but for giving it alſo a degree of preciſion which poorer languages cannot ſupply.

The ſame thing may be exemplified in the nouns, though not, perhaps, in the ſame degree as in the verbs. Αρι, αρνιον, αμνος, are uſed by the Evangeliſts, the firſt by Luke, the other two by John; and are all rendered, in the common tranſlation, *lamb*: δικτυον, αμφιβληστρον, σαγηνη, in the Goſpels are all tranſlated *net*. And though the latter might have been varied in the verſion, the other could not with propriety. Sometimes we are obliged to render different words which occur pretty often, but are not entirely ſynonymous, by the ſame Engliſh word, for want of diſtinct terms adapted to each meaning. Thus, the words παιδια and τεκνα are, If I miſtake not, uniformly rendered *children*; though the former word particularly reſpects the age and ſize, the latter ſolely the relation. The firſt anſwers to the Latin *pueruli*, the ſecond to *liberi*. The Engliſh word *children* is well adapted to the former, though ſometimes but awkwardly employed to denote the latter. Yet, for want of another term to expreſs the offſpring, without limiting it to either ſex, we find it neceſſary to uſe the Engliſh word in this application. The word ὁ πλησιον, uſed by the Evangeliſts mathew, Mark, and Luke, γειτων by Luke and John, and περιοικες only by Luke, are all rendered *neighbour*. And though they are evidently not of the ſame ſignification, it would be difficult, in our language, to expreſs the ſenſe of any of them in one word, which would anſwer ſo well as this. Yet, that they are not ſynonymous, every one who underſtands Greek muſt be ſenſible, on reflection. For if, inſtead of πλησιον, in the commandment, Αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σου ὡς σεαυτον, *Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf*, we ſhould ſubſtitute either γειτονα, or περιοικον, we ſhould totally alter the precept; for theſe terms would comprehend none but thoſe who live within what is ſtrictly called the neigbourhood. The tranſlation, indeed, into Engliſh ought to be the ſame; and, to ſay the truth, it would be a more exact verſion of that precept, than it is of the precept, as we actually find it in the Goſpel. For, let it be obſerved, that the word *neighbour* is one of thoſe which, for want of more appoſite terms, we are obliged to admit, in Scripture, in a meaning not perfectly warranted by common uſe.

I ſhall add but one other example. The word φιλος, uſed by Matthew, Luke, and John, and εταιρος, uſed only by Matthew, are both rendered *friend*; yet, in their genuine ſignification, there is but little affinity between them. The former always implies affection and regard, the latter does not. The latter, not the former, was employed as a civil compellation to ſtrangers and indifferent perſons. It is that which is given, in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard (*a*), to the envious and diſſatisfied labourer; in the parable of the marriage feaſt (*b*), to the gueſt who had not the wedding garment; and it was given by our Lord to the traitor Judas (*c*), when he came to deliver him up to his enemies. I do not ſay that εταιρε is not rightly tranſlated *friend* in

(*a*) Matth. xx. 13. (*b*) xxii. 12. (*c*) xxvi. 50.

in these instances; for common use permits us to employ the word in this latitude. But it is to be regretted, that we have not a word better adapted to such cases, but are obliged to prostitute a name so respectable as that of *friend*. Besides, it is manifest that, for this prostitution, we cannot plead the example of the Evangelists. I make this remark the more willingly, as I have heard some unlearned readers express their surprize that our Lord should have paid so much deference to the insincere modes of civility established by the corrupt customs of the world, as to denominate a man *friend*, whom he knew to harbour the basest and the most hostile intentions. But defects of this kind are not peculiar to our language. They are, on the contrary, to be found in every tongue. All the Latin translations render the word, in the passages abovementioned, *amice*: and all the versions into modern tongues, with which I am acquainted, except one, act in the same manner. The exception meant is the Geneva French, which says not *mon ami*, as others, but *compagnon*, in all the three places mentioned. This is more literal, for εταιρος is, strictly, *socius*, or *sodalis*, not *amicus*. But it may be questioned, whether such a compellation suits the idiom of that tongue, as it appears to have been adopted by no other French interpreter.

§ 12. I shall now give, from the first of the lists of verbs abovementioned, an instance or two of the uniformity commonly observed in the use of this variety, an uniformity which sufficiently evinces, that the terms were not conceived by the writers to be perfectly synonymous. Our Lord says, in his sermon on the mount (*a*), Ηκουσατε οτι ΕΡΡΕΘΗ τοις αρχαιοις· Ου φονευσεις—Εγω δε ΛΕΓΩ υμιν, οτι—ος αν ΕΙΠΗ τω αδελφω αυτου, Ρακα:—In the common translation, *Ye have heard that it was* SAID *by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill—But I* SAY *unto you, that—whosoever shall* SAY *to his brother, Raca*—In the English, the verb *say* occurs thrice in this short passage; in the Greek, there are three different verbs employed. Yet so little does there appear, in the author, a disposition to change, for the sake of changing, that wherever the case is perfectly similar to that wherein any of the three verbs abovementioned is used in this quotation, the word will be found to be the same throughout the whole discourse. Thus, through the whole of this discourse, what our Lord authoritatively gives in charge, as from himself, is signified by the same phrase, εγω λεγω υμιν; whatever is mentioned as standing on the foot of oral tradition, is expressed by ερρεθη; part of the verb ρεω; and what is mentioned as neither precept nor maxim of any kind, but as what may pass incidentally in conversation, is denoted by the verb ειπω. Another example of the different application of such words, we have in our Lord's conversation with the chief priests and elders, in relation to the authority by which he acted (*b*). Οι δε διελογιζοντο παρ' εαυτοις, ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ, Εαν ΕΙΠΩΜΕΝ, εξ ουρανου, ΕΡΕΙ ημιν· Διατι ουν ουκ επιστευσατε αυτω; A little after, ΕΦΗ αυτοις και αυτος. In the common translation, *And they reasoned with themselves,* SAYING, *If we shall* SAY *from heaven, he will* SAY *unto us, Why did ye not then believe him?* Afterwards, *And he* SAID *unto them.* Here the same repetition in the version is contrasted with a still greater variety in in the original; for we have no fewer than four different words in the Greek, rendered into our language, by repeating the same English verb four times. The sense of ειπω is the same in both passages; the word λεγω is used here more indefinitely than in the former; the verb ρεω approaches in meaning to the word *retort*, and seems to preclude reply.

On comparing, we must perceive, that there is not only an awkwardness in the repetitions which modern languages sometimes render necessary, but even a feebleness in the enunciation of the sentiment. This consideration, when attended to, will be found to warrant our taking the greater liberty in diversifying the expression wherever our language permits it. For if we are often obliged to repeat the same, where the original employs different words; and if we also retain the same words, where the original retains the same, though our own tongue would allow a change, the style of the version must be a bad representation of that of the original. It will have all the defects of both languages, and none of the riches of either. I have, therefore, taken the liberty to vary the expression a little, where the genius of our tongue, in a consistency with simplicity, propriety and perspicuity, permitted it; as it was only thus I could compensate for the restraints I was obliged to submit to, in cases wherein the sacred penmen had taken a freer range.

§ 13. Concerning the diversity of styles in the different Evangelists, which I cannot help considering as entitled to more attention than translators seem to have given it, I shall beg leave to make a few more observations. Of the words which I have mentioned as nearly synonymous, or at least as rendered by most interpreters in the same manner, some, though common in some of the Gospels, do not occur in others; yet, in no version that I know, is this always to be discovered. The verb ρεω, *I say*, is

(*a*) Matth. v. 21. 22.

(*b*) Matth. xxi. 25. 27.

is uſed by Matthew often, by Mark once, but never by either Luke or John. The ſynonyme ειρω, is uſed by all except John, and φημι by all except Mark. Ανακλινω, *I lay down*, occurs in all the Goſpels except John's; κατακειμαι *I lie down*, in all except Matthew's. Every one of the Evangeliſts has alſo many words to be found in none of the reſt; and that not only when peculiar things are mentioned by him, but when the ſame things, the ſame actions, the ſame circumſtances, which are taken notice of by other Evangeliſts, are related. Theſe it is ſometimes impoſſible to tranſlate juſtly in different words. Luke ſometimes, in addreſſing God, uſes the word δεσποτης, which is not in any of the other Evangeliſts, and can hardly be rendered otherwiſe than *Lord*, the term whereby κυριος, which occurs in them all, is commonly tranſlated. Luke is alſo peculiar in giving Jeſus Chriſt the title επισατης, which cannot well be rendered otherwiſe than *maſter*, the common rendering of διδασκαλος, though, as Grotius obſerves, the words are not perfectly equivalent. Matthew has, in one place applied to our Lord a title not uſed by any other, καθηγητης, which our tranſlators have alſo rendered *maſter*, and have thereby impaired the ſenſe. In like manner the multiplicity of inflections in the tenſes, moods, and voices of their verbs, ſupplies them with a variety of expreſſions which ſerves to diverſify their ſtyle in a manner not to be imitated in modern tongues, and leſs perhaps in Engliſh, which has very few inflections, than in any other. Add to the aforeſaid advantages, in reſpect of variety, which the writers of the New Teſtament derived from their language, the derivatives and compounds with which that copious tongue ſo remarkably abounds.

Now, I do not know any ſtronger indications of a native difference of ſtyle than thoſe above mentioned, and in part exemplified. And, as this difference conveys ſome evidence of the authenticity of the writings, it ought not to be always diſregarded by tranſlators, merely becauſe it is not poſſible always to preſerve it in their verſions. It is then in effect preſerved, when they give ſuch a turn to the expreſſion, as renders the difference of phraſeology nearly equal upon the whole. This, however, ought never to be attempted, when either the ſenſe may be ever ſo little altered by it, or the ſimplicity and perſpicuity of the ſentence may be injured. What has been now obſerved will account for my employing words ſometimes, which, though not unuſual or obſcure, are not the moſt obvious, and for giving ſuch a turn to the expreſſion, as renders it leſs literal than it might otherwiſe have been.

§ 14. I HAVE avoided, as much as poſſible, the uſe of circumlocution: yet there are certain caſes where we cannot avoid it entirely, and do juſtice to our author. I do not mean barely, when there is not a ſingle word in the language of the tranſlation which conveys the ſenſe of the original term; but when there is ſomething, either in the application or in the argument, that cannot be fully exhibited without the aid of ſome additional terms. It has been often obſerved that, in no two languages, do the words ſo perfectly correſpond, that the ſame terms in one will always expreſs the ſenſe of the ſame terms in the other. There is a difference of extent in meaning which hinders them from ſuiting exactly, even when they coincide in the general import. The epithet αχρειος, as applied in the Goſpel of Luke (*a*), is ſo far from ſuiting the ſenſe of the Engliſh word *unprofitable*, by which it is rendered in the common tranſlation, that if we were to give a definition of an unprofitable ſervant, we ſhould hardly think of another than the reverſe of the character given in that paſſage, but ſhould ſay, 'he is one who does 'not that to his maſter which is his duty to do.' From the context, however, no perſon can be at a loſs to ſee that the import of the word is, "We have "conferred no favour, we have only fulfilled the "terms which we were bound to perform." I know that becauſe this ſentiment is not expreſſed with the brevity of the original, many would call this a comment, or rather a paraphraſe, and not a verſion. It is expreſſed, I acknowledge, by a periphraſis; but periphraſis and paraphraſe are not ſynonymous terms. The former is in every tranſlation ſometimes neceſſary, in order to tranſmit the genuine thought and reaſoning of the author: it is only when more than this is attempted, and when other ſentiments are introduced or ſuggeſted, for the ſake of illuſtrating an author's thoughts, or enforcing his arguments, that men employ paraphraſe. It is not denied, that periphraſis in tranſlating, ought to be avoided, if poſſible; but it is not always poſſible to avoid it, and periphraſis is preferable to ſingle words, which either convey no meaning, or convey a meaning different from the author's.

The word βαπτισμα, in the queſtion put by our Lord, Το βαπτισμα Ιωαννη ποθεν ην (*b*); does not anſwer to the word *baptiſm*, as uſed by us; nor does αναστασις, in the account given of the Sadducees (*c*), correſpond entirely to the Engliſh word *reſurrection*: the word επαγγελια is, for the moſt part, rendered *promiſe*, and means neither more nor leſs. In a few caſes, however, it does not ſignify the promiſe itſelf, but the thing promiſed. Now the Engliſh word is never

(*a*) Luke xvii. 10. (*b*) Matth. xxi. 25. (*c*) Matth. xxii. 23.

ſo applied. Hence the obſcurity, not to ſay impropriety, of that expreſſion, *I ſend the promiſe of my Father upon you* (*a*), which, if it can be ſaid to ſuggeſt any thing to an Engliſh reader, ſuggeſts aukwardly, *I give you a promiſe on the part of my Father.* Yet this is not the ſenſe. What is here meant is the fulfilment of a promiſe formerly given them by his Father, and is therefore properly rendered, *I ſend you that which my Father hath promiſed.* Through not attending to this difference, our tranſlators have thrown great darkneſs on ſome paſſages in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. *Theſe all* (ſays the writer, ſpeaking of Abraham, Sarah, and others) *died in the faith not having received the promiſes,* μη λαβοντες τας επαγγελιας (*b*). Yet this way interpreted, the aſſertion is contradictory, not only to the patriarchal hiſtory, but to what is ſaid expreſsly of Abraham in the ſame chapter (*c*). The words, therefore, ought to have been rendered, *not having received the promiſed inheritance*; for it is the land of Canaan promiſed to Abraham and his poſterity, to which the writer particularly refers, giving as an evidence that they had not received it, their acknowledging themſelves to be *ſtrangers and ſojourners in the land;* not *on the earth,* as it is, particularly in this place, very improperly tranſlated.

§ 15. AGAIN, ſuppoſe, which is not uncommon, that the original word has two different, but related ſenſes, and that the author had an alluſion to both. Suppoſe alſo that in the language of the interpreter there is a term adapted to each of thoſe ſenſes, but not any one word that will ſuit both. In ſuch caſes perſpicuity requires ſomewhat of periphraſis. If we abruptly change the word in the ſame ſentence, or in the ſame argument, there will appear an incoherence in the verſion, where there appears a cloſe connection in the original; and if we retain the ſame term, there will be both obſcurity and impropriety in the verſion. I ſhall explain my meaning by examples, the only way of making ſuch criticiſms underſtood.

In one place in Matthew (*d*), the verb τιμαω is employed, as uſual, to expreſs the duty which children owe to their parents. *To honour* is that commonly uſed in Engliſh. Yet this word is not equivalent in import to the Greek verb, much leſs to the Hebrew כבד *chabad* tranſlated τιμαω by the Seventy in the place quoted by the Evangeliſt. This is one of the cauſes of the obſcurity and apparent inconſequence of that paſſage in the Goſpel. I have, therefore, rendered the word, where it occurs the ſecond time in the argument uſed by our Lord, *honour by his aſſiſtance;* for the original implies no leſs.

The Apoſtle Paul, writing to the Romans (for it is not neceſſary here to confine myſelf to the Goſpels), ſays (*e*), as it is expreſſed in the common verſion, *But they have not all obeyed the Goſpel; for Eſaias ſaith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.* What the Apoſtle introduces here with *So then,* as a direct concluſion from the words of the Prophet, cannot fail to appear remote to an Engliſh reader, and to require ſome intermediate ideas to make out the connection. The incoherency diſappears entirely, when we recur to the original, where the words are: Αλλ' ου παντες υπηκουσαν τω ευαγγελιω. Ησαιας γαρ λεγει, Κυριε, τις επιστευσε τη ακοη ημων; Αρα η πιστις εξ ακοης· η δε ακοη δια ρηματος Θεου. Nothing can be more clearly conſequential than the argument as expreſſed here. Iſaiah had ſaid, complaining of the people, Τις επιστευσε τη ακοη ημων; from which the Apoſtle infers, that it commonly holds ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΕΞ ΑΚΟΗΣ, otherwiſe there had been no ſcope for complaint. But, by the change of the term in Engliſh from *report* to *hearing*, however nearly the ideas are related, the expreſſion is remarkably obſcured. It muſt be owned, that we have no word, in Engliſh, of equal extent, in ſignification, with the Greek ακοη, which denotes both the *report*, or the thing heard, and the ſenſation of hearing; though, in regard to the ſenſe of ſeeing, the Engliſh word *ſight* is of equal latitude: for it denotes both the thing ſeen, and the perception received by the eye (*f*). But, when ſuch a difference as this happens, between the import of their words and ours, one does more juſtice to the original, and interprets more ſtrictly, by giving the ſentence ſuch a turn as will preſerve the verbal alluſion, than by ſuch a change of the terms as our tranſlators have adopted, to the no ſmall injury of perſpicuity. The paſſage may, therefore, properly be rendered thus: *For Iſaiah ſaith,* "*Lord, who believeth what he heareth us preach?*" *So then, belief cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God preached.* Nor is the addition of the participle *preached,* to be conſidered as a ſupply, from conjecture, of what is not expreſſed in the original; for, in fact, the word ακοη here implies it. Diodati has not badly tranſlated it *preaching. Signore, chi a creduto alla noſtra predicatione? La fede adunque e dalla predicatione.* This is better than the Engliſh verſion, as it preſerves clearly the connection of the two verſes. It is, nevertheleſs, of importance,

(*a*) Luke xxiv. 49. See all theſe paſſages in this Tranſlation, and the notes upon them.
(*b*) Heb. xi. 13. (*c*) Ver. 14. (*d*) Matth. xv. 4, 5. (*e*) Rom. x. 16, 17.
(*f*) See an excellent illuſtration of this in Dr. Beattie's Eſſay on Truth, Part II. Ch. II. Sect. I.

not to ſuppreſs the other ſignification of ακοη, to wit, *hearing*, as, by means of it, the connection is rendered clearer, both with the preceding words, *How ſhall they believe in him of whom they have not heard*(*a*)? and with the following, *But, I ſay, Have they not heard*(*b*)? I ſhall only add, that where the coincidence in the ſenſe is very clear, the grammatical relation between the words is of leſs importance. There is, in this paſſage a verbal connection, not only between the words ακουω and ακοη, but alſo between πιστευω and πιστις. But the Engliſh word *faith*, being fully equivalent to the Greek word πιστις, and its connection with believing being evident, it is not of great moment to preſerve in Engliſh the affinity in ſound. As ſuch reſemblances, however, always in ſome degree aſſiſt attention, and add a ſort of evidence, it is rather better to retain them, where it can be done without hurting the ſenſe. For this reaſon, I prefer the word *belief*, here, to the word *faith*.

I ſhall give but one other example, which, though not requiring the aid of circumlocution, is of a nature ſomewhat ſimilar to the former. A verb, or an epithet, in the original, is ſometimes conſtrued with a noun, uſed figuratively, and is alſo conſtrued, becauſe uſe permits the application, with that which is repreſented by the figure; whereas in the tranſlator's language, the term, by which the verb or epithet is commonly rendered, is not equally ſuſceptible of both applications. In ſuch caſes, it is better, when the thing is practicable, to change the word, for one which, though leſs common, ſuits both. The following paſſage will illuſtrate my meaning (*c*): Περιεχει εν τη γραφη· "Ιδου τιθημι εν Σιων "λιθον ακρογωνιαιον, εκλεκτον, εντιμον· και ὁ πιστευων επ' αυτω, "ου μη καταισχυνθη." Υμιν ουν ἡ τιμη τοις πιστευουσιν· απειθουσι δε λιθος ὁν απεδοκιμασαν ὁι οικοδομουντες, ὁυτος εγενηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας; which our tranſlators render thus: *It is contained in the Scripture,* "*Behold, I lay in Sion* "*a chief corner-ſtone, elect, precious: and he that be-*"*lieveth on him ſhall not be confounded.*" *Unto you, therefore, which believe, he is precious: but unto them which be diſobedient, the ſtone which the builders diſallowed, the ſame is made the head of the corner.* Here the type and the antitype are ſo blended, as to hurt, alike, both perſpicuity and propriety. To ſpeak of *believing in a ſtone, an elect ſtone*, and to apply the pronoun *him* to a ſtone, ſound very oddly in our language; but πιστευω επι, in the Helleniſtic idiom, and εκλεκτος, admit an application either to perſons or to things. The Apoſtle ſaid, επ' αυτω, becauſe λιθος is of the maſculine gender: for the like reaſon, he would have ſaid, επ' αυτη, had he uſed πετρα inſtead of λιθος. Would our tranſlators, in that caſe, have rendered it, *He who believeth on her*? Now, the Engliſh verb *to confide*, and the participle *ſelected*, are ſuſceptible of both applications. Let the paſſage, then, be rendered thus: *It is ſaid in Scripture,* "*Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-ſtone, ſelected* "*and precious: whoſoever confideth in it ſhall not be* "*aſhamed.*" *There is honour, therefore, to you who confide; but to the miſtruſtful, the ſtone which the builders rejected, is made the head of the corner.* I may remark, in paſſing, that ἡ τιμη is here evidently oppoſed to ἡ αισχυνη, the import of which is included in the verb καταισχυνθη; inſtead of *ſhame* ye ſhall have *honour;* but by no rule, that I know, can it be tranſlated, *he is precious.* Απειθουσι, though often juſtly rendered *diſobedient*, rather ſignifies, here, *miſtruſtful, incredulous*, being contraſted to πιστευουσι. All the above examples are calculated to ſhow, that it is as impoſſible for a tranſlator, if he preſerve that uniformity in tranſlating ſo much inſiſted on by ſome, to convey perſpicuouſly, or even intelligibly, the meaning of the author, and to give a juſt repreſentation of his manner, as it is to retain any regard to purity in the language which he writes; and that, therefore, this abſurd κακοζηλια ſubverts, alike, all the principal ends which he ought to have in view.

§ 16. It was admitted, that it is neceſſary to employ more words than one in the verſion, when the original term requires more for conveying the ſenſe into the language of the tranſlator. Nobody doubts the propriety of rendering προσωποληπτης, *reſpecter of perſons*, φιλαργυρια, *love of money*, or, αποσυναγωγος, *expelled the ſynagogue;* and it is hardly poſſible to give the meaning in another language, without the aid of ſome ſuch periphraſis. Yet even this rule, however general it may appear, does not hold invariably. There are caſes wherein it is better to leave part of the meaning unexpreſſed, than by employing circumlocution, not only to deſert ſimplicity, but to ſuggeſt ſomething foreign to the intention of the author. That this will ſometimes be the conſequence of an over-ſcrupulous ſolicitude to comprehend every thing that may be implied in the original term will be evident on reflection. Zaccheus, the publican ſaid to our Lord (*d*), Ει τινος τι εσυκοφαντησα, αποδιδωμι τετραπλουν, which our tranſlators have rendered, *If I have taken any thing from any man by falſe accuſation, I reſtore him fourfold.* In this they have followed Beza, and Leo Juda, who ſay, *Si quid cuipiam per calumniam eripui, reddo quadruplum.* Admitting

(*a*) Rom. x. 14.
(*b*) Ver. 18.
(*c*) 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7.
(*d*) Luke xix. 8.

mitting the juſtneſs of the note ſubjoined by the latter, in regard to the artifices of the publicans, I approve much more the verſion of the word in the Vulgate and Eraſmus, *Si quid aliquem defraudavi*, or in Caſtalio, to the ſame purpoſe, *Si quem ulla re fraudavi*, "If in aught I have wronged any man;" than thoſe anxious attempts, by tracing little circumſtances, to reach the full import of the original. My objection to ſuch attempts, is not ſo much becauſe they render the expreſſion unneceſſarily complex, but becauſe ſomething foreign to the intention of the author, rarely fails to be ſuggeſted by them. However paradoxical it may at firſt appear, it is certainly true, that to expreſs a thing in one word, and to expreſs it in ſeveral, makes ſometimes a difference, not only in the ſtyle, but in the meaning. I need not go further, for an example, than the words on which I am remarking. For a man in the ſtation of Zaccheus, who was probably not liable to the charge of being injurious in any other way than that to which his buſineſs expoſed him, nothing could be more natural, or more appoſite, than the expreſſion which the Evangeliſt repreſents him as having uſed, ει τινος τι εσυκοφαντησα. On the contrary, it would not have been natural in him to ſay, ει τι εκλεψα, or, ει τι εσυλησα, becauſe his manner of life, and his circumſtances, ſet him above the ſuſpicion of the crimes of theft and robbery. Such things, therefore, are not ſuppoſed to enter the perſon's mind. But when we ſubſtitute a circumlocution, that is, a definition, for the name of the crime, other kindred crimes are neceſſarily conceived to be in view; becauſe it is always by the aid of the genus, and the difference, ſomehow ſignified, that the ſpecies is defined. Now, in a caſe like the preſent, wherein the purpoſe of reſtitution is explicitly declared, to introduce mention of the genus, with the limitation denoted by the ſpecific difference, is an implicit declaration, that the promiſe of reparation ſhall not be underſtood to extend to any other ſpecies of injuries. Had our language been that ſpoken in Judea, and had this humble publican, when he made his penitent declaration to his Lord, ſaid in Engliſh, *I will reſtore fourfold, if in aught I have wronged any man*; can we imagine, that he would have clogged his pious purpoſe, with the reſerve which the additional words, *by falſe accuſation*, manifeſtly imply? Who ſees not that, in this manner introduced, they are ſuch a reſtriction of the promiſe, as is equivalent to the retracting of it in part, and ſaying, 'Let it be obſerved, that as to any other ſort of wrong I may have committed, I promiſe nothing?' But when the thing is expreſſed in one word, as in the Greek, no ſuch effect is produced. Much, therefore, of the meaning, depends on the form of the expreſſion, as well as on the import of the words.

§ 17. But this is not the only bad conſequence which reſults from the exceſſive ſolicitude of interpreters, to comprehend in their tranſlation, by the aid of periphraſis, every thing ſuppoſed to be included in the original term. A ſingle word is ſometimes uſed, with energy and perſpicuity, as a trope. But if we ſubſtitute a definition for the ſingle word, we deſtroy the trope, and often render the ſentence nonſenſical. To ſay, *The meek ſhall inherit the earth* (*a*), is to employ the word *inherit* in a figurative ſenſe, which can hardly be miſunderſtood by any body, as denoting the facility with which they ſhall obtain poſſeſſion, and the ſtability of the poſſeſſion obtained. But, if we employ circumlocution, and ſay, in the manner of ſome interpreters, *The meek ſhall ſucceed to the earth by hereditary right*; by ſo explicit, and ſo formal, a limitation of the manner, we exclude the trope, and affirm what is palpably inapplicable, and therefore ridiculous; for, *to obtain by hereditary right*, is to ſucceed, in right of conſanguinity, to the former poſſeſſor, now deceaſed. In ſuch caſes, if the tranſlator's language cannot convey the trope, in one word, with ſufficient clearneſs, a plain and proper term is much preferable to ſuch attemps at expreſſing, in ſeveral words, a figure, whoſe whole effect reſults from its ſimplicity and conciſeneſs.

§ 18. It is proper alſo to obſerve, that the idiom of one language will admit, in a conſiſtency with elegance and energy, redundancies in expreſſion, which have a very different effect, tranſlated into another language. A few examples of this occur in the New Teſtamennt. Ὑποποδιον των ποδων αυτε (*b*), is adequately rendered, in the common tranſlation, *his footſtool*, but is literally *footſtool of his feet*. It is the verſion given by the Seventy of the Hebrew phraſe הדם רגלי, in which there is no pleonaſm. Our tranſlators have imitated them in rendering ποιμην των προβατων *ſhepherd of the ſheep* (*c*); for here the redundancy is only in the verſion. The words ανηρ and ανθρωπος, are often by Greek authors, eſpecially the Attic, conſtrued with other ſubſtantives which, by a peculiar idiom, are uſed adjectively (*d*). Matthew joins ανθρωπος with εμπορος (*e*), with οικοδεσποτης (*f*), with βασιλευς (*g*); and John prefixes it to αμαρτωλος.

(*a*) Matth. v. 5.
(*b*) Matth. v. 35.
(*c*) John, x. 2.
(*d*) This idiom is not peculiarly Greek. In Geneſis, xiii. 8. *We are brethren*, is, in Hebrew, אנשים אחים אנחנו, in the Septuagint, ανθρωποι αδελφοι ημεις εσμεν, *We are men brethren*. Other examples might be produced.
(*e*) Matth. xiii. 45.
(*f*) Matth. xiii. 52.
(*g*) Matth. xviii. 23.

ἁμαρτωλος (*b*). Luke in ſimilar caſes, employs ανηρ, joining it to αμαρτωλος (*i*), προφητης (*k*), φονευς (*l*). In ſome inſtances our tranſlators have very properly dropt the redundant term; in others, for I know not what reaſon, they have retained it, thus dropping it, they ſay *a prophet, a murderer*, and *a certain king*. On another occaſion, in order to include both words, they ſay a *merchant-man*. But uſe, whoſe deciſions are very arbitrary, has long appropriated this name to *a trading ſhip*. They ſay alſo *a man that is an houſeholder, a man that is a ſinner* (*m*), and, in one place, not badly, *a ſinful man* (*n*). In theſe, however, we muſt acknowledge, there is no deviation from the meaning. Such ſuperfluous words as ſome of theſe now mentioned, enfeeble the expreſſion, but without altering or darkening the ſenſe.

But there is one caſe wherein this uſe of the noun ανηρ, has in the common verſion, occaſioned a ſmall deviation from the meaning. The words ανδρες αδελφοι frequently occur in the Acts, and are always rendered, by our tranſlators *Men and brethren*, as if the phraſe were ανδρες και αδελφοι, thereby making them two diſtinct appellations. This I once thought peculiar to Engliſh tranſlators, but have ſince found that the ſame method is in one place adopted by Luther, in his German tranſlation, who ſays, **Ihr manner und bruder.** (*o*). Some foreign verſions have ſcrupulouſly preſerved the pleonaſtic form; one ſays *hommes freres*, another *huomini fratelli*; which are equally aukward in French and Italian, as *men brethren* would be in Engliſh; but into none of the verſions in theſe languages which I have ſeen is the conjunction inſerted. Our interpreters muſt have proceeded on the ſuppoſition, that the Apoſtles, by ſuch compellations, divided their hearers into two claſſes, one of whom they barely denominated *men*, the other they more affectionately ſaluted *brethren*. But that there is no foundation for this conceit is manifeſt; firſt, in that caſe by the ſyntactic order, the copulative και muſt have been inſerted between the titles. Yet though ανδρες αδελφοι occurs in the Acts no fewer than thirteen times, no example of ανδρες και αδελφοι is to be found. Secondly, it is, as was ſignified above, entirely in the Greek idiom. Ανδρες στρατιωται *ſoldiers*, ανδρες δικασται *judges*, in like manner as ανδρες Αθηναιοι *Athenians*, are warranted by the example of Demoſthenes, and the beſt writers in Greece. Thirdly, there is the ſame reaſon to introduce the copulative in the other examples above quoted, and to render ανθρωπος εμπορος *a man and a merchant*, ανηρ ἁμαρτωλος, *a man and a ſinner*, and ſo of the reſt, as ανδρες αδελφοι *men and brethren*. It may be thought that in the addreſs Ανδρες αδελφοι και πατερες, as no conjunction is needed in the verſion but what is expreſſed in the original, the word *men* ought to be preſerved. But the uſe above examined ſufficiently ſhows that, in all ſuch caſes, the word ανδρες is to be conſidered not as a ſeparate title, but as an idiomatic ſuplement to αδελφοι και πατερες, the only titles given, and that therefore in tranſlations into modern tongues, it ought to be dropt as an expletive which does not ſuit their idiom. The above criticiſm will alſo ſerve as one of the many evidences, that what is vulgarly called the moſt literal tranſlation, is not always the moſt cloſe.

§ 19. It may be proper alſo to obſerve, that the import of diminutives is not always to be determined by the general rules laid down by grammarians. Βιβλιον is only in form a diminutive of βιβλος, οικια of οικος, δαιμονιον of δαιμων; the ſame may be ſaid of εριφιον as uſed in the Goſpel. It cannot be underſtood as expreſſing littleneſs; for what is called εριφια in the only place where the word occurs (*p*), is εριφοι in the verſe immediately preceeding. The like may be ſaid of οναριον and ονος. And the application in that paſſage ſhows ſufficiently, that it is not an expreſſion of affection or tenderneſs. Πινακιδιον in Luke (*q*), denotes a thing differing rather in kind and uſe, than in dimenſions from πιναξ, as uſed by the ſame Evangeliſt (*r*). Some diminutives are intended to mark a diſtinction only in age or in ſize, as θυγατριον, βιβλαριδιον, αψαριον, ιχθυδιον, κλινιδιον, πλοιαριον, παιδιον, παιδαριον; and may be rendered into Engliſh by the aid of the epithet *little*, as *little daughter*, *little book*, *little fiſh*, or by a ſingle word adapted to the meaning in the paſſage where it occurs, as *couch*, *boat*, *child*, *boy*, *infant*. Τεκνιον appears, on the contrary, more expreſſive of affection than of ſize; τεκνια is therefore better rendered *dear children* than *little children*, which, when addreſſed to grown perſons, ſounds very oddly. Sometimes the diminutive expreſſes contempt, In this way the word γυναικαρια is uſed by Paul (*s*), and is not badly tranſlated *ſilly women*. But in many caſes it muſt be acknowledged that the difference which a diminutive makes, though real, is of too delicate a nature to be transfuſed into a verſion. For when a tranſlator, becauſe the language which he writes, does not afford a term exactly equivalent, makes a ſtretch for a word; that word often farther exceeds the import of the original, than the common term

(*b*) John, ix. 16.
(*i*) Luke, v. 8. xix. 7.
(*k*) Luke, xxiv. 19.
(*l*) Acts, iii. 14.
(*m*) Luke, xix. 7. John, ix. 16.
(*n*) Luke, v. 8.
(*o*) Acts, i. 16.
(*p*) Matth. xxv. 33.
(*q*) Luke, i. 63.
(*r*) Luke, xi. 39.
(*s*) 2 Tim. iii. 6.

term would have fallen below it. For example, in the check which our Lord at firſt gave to the application of the Syrophenician woman, I conſider the diminutive κυναρια as more emphatical in that place than κυνες; yet I think it is incomparably better rendered in the common verſion *dogs*, than in that of the anonymous tranſlator *puppies*.

Nay, in the few caſes (for they are but few) in which our language has provided us in diminutives, it is not always proper to render the Greek diminutive by the Engliſh. Αρνιον, for example, is in Greek the diminutive of αρς, ſo is *lambkin* of *lamb* in Engliſh, which is the only proper verſion of αρς. To tranſlate αρνιον *lambkin*, muſt therefore be entirely agreeable to the laws of literal interpretation. Yet who, that underſtands Engliſh, would heſitate to affirm that a tranſlator who ſhould ſo render the word, wherever it occurs in the New Teſtament, would betray a great defect both of taſte and of judgment? This is one of the many evidences we have, that without knowing ſomewhat of the ſentiments and manners of a people, with which the genius of their language is intimately connected, we may, in tranſlating their works, exhibit an uncouth repreſentation of the dead letter, but are not qualified for tranſfuſing the ſenſe and ſpirit of their writings into the verſion. The Greek abounds in diminutives of every kind, though uſed but ſparingly in the Goſpels; nay, even in the diminutives of diminutives. They are admitted into all kinds of compoſition, both proſaic and poetical, the moſt ſolemn as well as the moſt ludicrous. It is quite otherwiſe with us. We have but few of that denomination, and thoſe few are hardly ever admitted into grave diſcuſſions. They are in a manner confined to paſtoral poetry, and romance, or at beſt to performances whoſe end is amuſement rather than inſtruction. It is only in theſe that ſuch words as *lordling*, *baby*, *manikin*, could be tolerated. Αρνιον, in Greek, is a word of ſufficient dignity, which *lambkin* in Engliſh is not. This term ſhows rather a playful than a ſerious diſpoſition in the perſon who uſes it. I have been the more particular here in order to ſhow that, if we would tranſlate with propriety, more knowledge is requiſite than can be furniſhed by lexicons and grammars. So much for what, in tranſlating, concerns the juſtneſs of expreſſion neceſſary for promoting, the author's intention, and conveying his ſentiments.

§ 20. NEXT to the juſtneſs the perſpicuity of what is ſaid, will be univerſally admitted to be, of all the qualities of ſtyle, the moſt eſſential. Some indeed ſeem to think that this is peculiarly the author's province, and no farther the tranſlator's, than he has the warrant of his original. Such was the opinion of Le Clerc, a man of conſiderable name in literature. "Quamvis Latina lingua," ſays he (*t*), "perſpicuitate multò magis quam Hebraica gaudeat, "imò verò obſcuritatem, quantum poteſt, vitare ſo- "leat: ubi Hebraica obſcura ſunt, tranſlationem "noſtram obſcuriorem eſſe non diffitemur. Sed ut "ea demum effigies laudatur, non quæ vultum for- "moſum ſpectandum, ſed qualis eſt reverâ, ſpectan- "tium, oculis offert; ſic tranſlatio, ubi archetypus "ſermo clarus eſt, clara; ubi obſcurus obſcura eſſe "debet." This judgment he qualifies with the following words: "Obſcura autem hìc vocamus, non "quæ Hebraicæ linguæ neſciis obſcura ſunt, ſic enim "pleræque loquutiones ſcripturæ obſcuræ eſſent, ſed "quæ a linguæ non imperitis hodie non ſatis intelli- "guntur. Contrà verò clara eſſe dicimus, non ea "tantum quæ omnibus, etiam imperitis aperta ſunt, "ſed quæ linguæ peritioribus nullum negotium fa- "ceſſunt." But even with this qualification the ſentiment does not appear defenſible. It makes the ſtandard of perſpicuity what it is impoſſible for any perſon exactly to know, namely, the degree of knowledge in the original attained (not by the tranſlator, but) by the learned in general in the Oriental languages at the time. "Obſcura vocamus quæ a "linguæ non imperitis *hodie*, non ſatis intelliguntur," In conſequence of which the Scriptures ought to be tranſlated more perſpicuouſly at one time than at another, becauſe the original is better underſtood at one time than at another. That in fact they will be ſo, when in the hands of a tranſlator of ſuperior capacity and knowledge, cannot be queſtioned. But by this critic's rule, if I underſtand him right, the interpreter ought not to avail himſelf of greater abilities, if he have greater abilities; but, however clear the ſentiments are to him, he ought to render them obſcurely, if the original appear obſcure to the critics of the age. In this caſe it would be of little conſequence, whether the tranſlator were profoundly ſkilled in the languages or not. The only thing of importance would be, that he were well verſed in the interpretations and comments of others. This is ſo abſurd, that I cannot allow myſelf to think that it was the fixed opinion of that critic, or the rule by which he conducted himſelf in tranſlating; yet it is hardly poſſible to put another conſtruction upon his words.

§ 21. HOUBIGANT, without minding the qualification above quoted, ſeverely cenſures the general poſition, that the obſcurities of an author ought to be rendered obſcurely. "Obſcurus," ſays he (*u*), "eſt

2

(*t*) Proleg. in Pent. Diſſ. II. § 4.

(*u*) Proleg. Cap. V. Art. III.

" eſt non ſemel Horatius; num igitur laudanda ea " erit Horatii Gallica interpretatio, quæ Horatium " faciet Gallico ſermone, ubi clarus eſt, clarè, ubi " obſcurus, obſcurè loquentem?" I muſt, however, ſay ſo much for Le Clerc, as to acknowledge, that the caſes compared by Houbigant, are not parallel. Greater freedom may reaſonably be uſed with profane authors than with the ſacred. If the general tenor and connection be preſerved in the thoughts of a Greek or Latin poet, and if the diction be harmonious and elegant, a few miſtakes about the import of words, by which the ſcope of the whole is little affected, will be thought, even by the moſt faſtidious critics, a more pardonable fault than ſuch obſcurity as interrupts a reader, and makes it difficult for him to divine the ſenſe. But it is otherwiſe with a book of ſo great authority as the Scriptures. It is better that, in them, the reader ſhould ſometimes be at a loſs about the ſentiment, than that he ſhould have a falſe ſentiment impoſed upon him for a dictate of the Spirit of God. I approve much more what follows in Houbigant: " Humani ingenii eſt, non linguæ cu- " juſcunque, obſcuritas, divini ſermonis dos perpe- " tua, ut dignitas, ita etiam perſpicuitas. Ut quan- " quam obſcura nunc eſſet Hebraica lingua, tamen " dubitandum non eſſet, quæ ſacri autores ſcripſe- " runt, perſpicuè ſcripſiſſe: nobis igitur eſſe maxime " elaborandum, ut quæ nunc nobis obſcura eſſe vi- " deantur, ad priſtinam nativamque perſpicuitatem, " quoad fieri poteſt, revocemus; non autem nos " nobis contentos eſſe debere, ſi quæ prima ſpecie " obſcura erant, obſcurè converterimus." I have already given my reaſons (*x*) for thinking that the hiſtorical ſtyle of the Scriptures, in conſequence of its greater ſimplicity, is naturally more perſpicuous than that of moſt other writings. But it is impoſſible that their ſenſe ſhould appear, even to men of profound erudition, with the ſame facility and clearneſs, as it did to the countrymen and cotemporaries of the inſpired writers, men familiarized to their idiom, and well acquainted with all the cuſtoms and manners to which there are, in thoſe writings, incidental alluſions. If then, to adopt Le Clerc's ſimilitude, we prefer likeneſs to the original before beauty, we muſt endeavour to make our tranſlation as perſpicuous to our readers, as we have reaſon to think the writings of Moſes were, not to modern linguiſts, but to the ancient Iſraelites, and the writings of the Evangeliſts to the Helleniſt Jews. This is the only way, in my judgment, in which, conſiſtently with common ſenſe, we can ſay that a reſemblance, in perſpicuity, is preſerved in the tranſlation.

§ 22. But it may be aſked, Is there then no caſe whatever, wherein it may be pardonable, or even proper, to be, in ſome degree, obſcure? I acknowledge that there are ſuch caſes, though they occur but ſeldom in the hiſtorical books. Firſt, it is pardonable to be obſcure, or even ambiguous, when it is neceſſary for avoiding a greater evil. I conſider it as a greater evil in a tranſlator, to aſſign a meaning merely from conjecture, for which he is conſcious he has little or no foundation. In ſuch caſes, the method taken by Caſtalio is the only unexceptionable method, to give a literal tranſlation of the words, and acknowledge our ignorance of the meaning. For the ſame reaſon there will be a propriety in retaining even ſome ambiguities in the verſion. But this method ought to be taken only, when the interpreter, uſing his beſt judgment, thinks there is ground to doubt which of the two ſenſes, ſuggeſted by the words, is the meaning of the author. If the language of the verſion be ſuſceptible of the ſame ambiguity which he finds in the original, it ought to be preſerved; but if the language be not ſuſceptible of it, which often happens, the tranſlator ſhould inſert the meaning he prefers in the text, and take notice of the other in the notes, or on the margin.

I ſhall give ſome examples of both. The Evangeliſt ſays (*y*), Ην το φως το αληθινον ο φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομενον, εις τον κοσμον. Here we have an ambiguity in the word ερχομενον, which may be either the nominative neuter, agreeing with φως, or the accuſative maſculine, agreeing with ανθρωπον. Our tranſlators have preferred the latter meaning, and ſaid, *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* It was hardly poſſible to preſerve the native ſimplicity of the expreſſion, and retain the ambiguity in Engliſh. I have, therefore, as I preferred the former meaning, rendered the verſe, *The true light was he, who coming into the world, enlighteneth every man*, and mentioned the other ſenſe in the note, aſſigning the reaſons which determined my choice.

Another Evangeliſt repreſents our Lord as ſaying (*z*), Λεγω υμιν, οτι υμεις οι ακολουθησαντες μοι, εν τη παλιγγενεσια, οταν καθισῃ ο υιος του ανθρωπου επι θρονου δοξης αυτου, καθισεσθε και υμεις επι δωδεκα θρονους, κρινοντες τας δωδεκα φυλας του Ισραηλ. Here the clauſe εν τη παλιγγενεσια, may be conſtrued either with the preceding words, or with the following. In the former of theſe ways our tranſlators have underſtood them, and have, therefore, rendered the verſe, *I ſay unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration; when the Son of man ſhall ſit in the throne of his glory, ye alſo ſhall ſit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Iſrael.*

(*x*) Diſſ. III. (*y*) John, i. 9. (*z*) Matth. xix. 28.

Iſrael. I think, on the contrary, that the words ought to be underſtood in the latter way, and have, therefore, tranſlated them in this manner: *I ſay unto you that at the renovation, when the Son of man ſhall be ſeated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, ſitting alſo upon twelve thrones, ſhall judge the twelve tribes of Iſrael.* For this choice I have aſſigned my reaſons in the note on the paſſage.

§ 23. BUT it ſometimes happens, that the preference of one of the meanings of an equivocal word or phraſe cannot be determined with probability ſufficient to ſatisfy a candid critic. In this caſe, when the verſion can be rendered equally ſuſceptible of the different meanings, candour itſelf requires, that the interpreter give it this turn. By ſo doing, he puts the unlearned reader on the ſame footing on which the learned reader is put by the author. It does not often happen that this is poſſible, but it happens ſometimes. The word αιων may denote, either the world, in the largeſt acceptation, or the age, ſtate, or diſpenſation of things, anſwering nearly to the Latin *ſeculum*. There are ſome paſſages in the New Teſtament, on which probable arguments may be advanced in favour of each interpretation. Nay, ſome have plauſibly contended, that in the prophetic ſtyle, there is no impropriety in admitting both ſenſes. Now, by rendering αιων, in thoſe doubtful caſes, *ſtate*, the ſame latitude is given the ſentiment in Engliſh, which the words have in the original. See the note on this paſſage in Matthew (*a*), ουκ αφεθησεται αυτω, ουτε εν τω νυν αιωνι, ουτε εν τω μελλοντι, which I have rendered, *will never be pardoned, either in the preſent ſtate, or in the future.*

§ 24. THERE are, moreover, a few inſtances, in which it cannot be doubted that there is an intentional obſcurity. In theſe it is plain, that the ſame degree of darkneſs which is found in the original ought, as far as poſſible, to be preſerved in the verſion. Predictions are rarely intended to be perfectly underſtood till after their fulfilment, and are intended to be then underſtood by means of their fulfilment. When our Lord ſaid to his diſciples, in his laſt conſolatory diſcourſe (*b*), *Within a little while ye ſhall not ſee me, a little while after ye ſhall ſee me, becauſe I go to the Father*, we learn, from what follows, that they did not underſtand him. Yet, though he perceived they were puzzled, he did not think proper to clear up the matter; but, that his words might make the deeper impreſſion upon their minds, he mentioned ſome additional circumſtances, the triumph of the world, the ſorrow of the diſciples at firſt, and joy afterwards. He knew that his death and reſurrection, which were ſoon to follow, would totally diſſipate all doubts about his meaning. It muſt be injudicious, therefore, to render the verſe in ſuch a manner as to leave no room, to perſons in their circumſtances, for doubt and perplexity. Yet in one verſion it is thus tranſlated: "In a very little time you will not ſee "me—in a very little time you will ſee me again— "for I am going to the Father, ſhortly to return." The laſt clauſe, *ſhortly to return*, for which there is no warrant in the original, removes the difficulty at once, and, conſequently, makes the diſciples appear, in the ſubſequent verſes, in a very ſtrange light, as being at a loſs to underſtand what is expreſſed in the cleareſt manner. It holds, therefore, true in general that, in tranſlating prophecy, we ought to avoid giving the verſion either more or leſs light than is found in the original. The anonymous tranſlator often errs in this way. Thus, in the prophecy on Mount Olivet, where our Lord ſays (*c*), *Theſe things muſt happen, but the end is not yet*, the laſt clauſe, ουπω εστι το τελος, he renders, *the end of the Jewiſh age is not yet.* There is nothing anſwering to the words *of the Jewiſh age* in the Goſpel. It is not certain that the word τελος here relates to the ſame event which is called συντελεια του αιωνος a little before (*d*). At any rate there is no mention of *Jews*, or *Jewiſh*, in the whole prophecy. Nay, if it were abſolutely certain, that the meaning is what this interpreter has expreſſed, it would be wrong to render it ſo, becauſe we have reaſon to conclude, that it was not without deſign that our Lord on that occaſion, employed more general terms.

§ 25. IN ſome caſes, it is particularly unſuitable to be more explicit than the ſacred authors, how certain ſo ever we be that we expreſs the meaning. A little reflection muſt ſatisfy every reaſonable perſon, that events depending on the agency of men, cannot with propriety, be revealed, ſo as to be perfectly intelligible to thoſe on whoſe agency they depend. For, if we ſuppoſe that the things predicted, are ſuch as they would not knowingly be the inſtruments of executing, either it will be in their power to defeat the intention of the prophecy, or they muſt be over-ruled in their actions by ſome blind fatality, and conſequently cannot be free agents in accompliſhing the prediction. Neither of theſe ſuits the methods of Providence. God does not force the wills of his creatures; but he makes both their errors and their vices conduce to effect his wiſe and gracious purpoſes. This conduct of Providence was never more eminently diſplayed, than in what related to the

(*a*) Matth. xii. 32.
(*b*) John, xvi. 16.
(*c*) Matth. xxiv. 6.
(*d*) Ver. 3.

the death and ſufferings of the Son of God. The predictions of the ancient Prophets are ſo appoſite, and ſo clearly explained by the events, that we are at no loſs to apply them; nay, we find ſome difficulty in conceiving how they could fail of being underſtood by thoſe who were the inſtruments of their accompliſhment. Yet, that they were miſunderſtood by them, we have the beſt authority to affirm: *I wot*, ſays Peter (*e*) to the people of Jeruſalem, who had, with clamour, demanded of Pilate the Crucifixion of Jeſus, 'that through ignorance 'ye did it, as did alſo your rulers; but thoſe things 'which God before had ſhowed by the mouth of all 'his Prophets, that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, he hath ſo fulfilled.' The predictions in the Goſpel are conveyed in the ſame idiom, and under the like figurative expreſſions, as are thoſe of the Old Teſtament. And though many of the events foretold, which are now accompliſhed, have put the meaning of ſuch prophecies beyond all queſtion, we ought not, in tranſlating them, to add any light borrowed merely from the accompliſhment. By ſo doing, we may even materially injure the hiſtory, and render thoſe miſtakes incredible, which, on a more exact repreſentation of things, as they muſt have appeared at the time, were entirely natural.

§ 26. THE commentator's buſineſs ought never to be confounded with the tranſlator's. It is the duty of the latter to give every thing to his readers, as much as poſſible, with the ſame advantages, neither more nor fewer, with which the ſacred author gave it to his contemporaries. There were ſome things that our Savour ſaid, as well as ſome things that he did, to his diſciples, which it was not intended that they ſhould underſtand then, but which, if taken notice of then, and remembered, they would underſtand afterwards. *Theſe things*, ſaid our Lord (*f*), *I have ſpoken to you in figures; the time cometh when I ſhall no longer ſpeak to you in figures; but inſtruct you plainly concerning the Father.* It was, therefore, not intended that every thing in the Goſpel ſhould be announced, at firſt, with plainneſs. It is, withal, certain, that the veil of figurative language thrown over ſome things, was employed to ſhade them only for a time, and, in the end, to conduce to their evidence and greater luſtre. *For there* was *no ſecret that* was *not to be diſcovered* or was *aught concealed which was not to be divulged* (*g*). Now, juſtice is not done to this wiſe conduct of the ſpirit, unleſs things be repreſented in this reſpect alſo, as nearly as poſſible, in his own manner. And thoſe tranſlators who have not attended to this, have ſometimes, by throwing more light than was proper on particular expreſſions, involved the whole paſſage in greater darkneſs, and made it harder to account for the facts recorded.

§ 27. AT the ſame time, let it be remembered, that the caſe of prophecy is in a great meaſure peculiar; and we have reaſon to think, that there is hardly any other caſe in which we are in danger of exceeding in perſpicuity. Even in thoſe places of the Goſpel, about the meaning of which expoſitors are divided, there is ground to believe, that there is no intended obſcurity in the original; but that the difficulty ariſes merely from an alluſion to ſome cuſtom, or an application of ſome term at that time familiar, but at preſent not eaſily diſcovered. Where the tranſlator is in the dark, his verſion ought not to be deciſive. But where he has rational grounds for forming a judgment, what he judges to be the ſenſe, he ought to expreſs with clearneſs.

§ 28. I HAVE oftner than once had occaſion to obſerve, that wherever propriety, perſpicuity, and the idiom of the tongue employed, permit an interpreter to be *cloſe*, the more he is ſo, the better. But what it is to be *literal*, I have never yet ſeen defined by any critic or grammarian, or even by any advocate for the literal manner of tranſlating. A reſemblance in ſound, by the frequent uſe of derivatives from the words of the original, cannot, where there is no coincidence in the ſenſe, confer on a tranſlator, even the ſlight praiſe of being literal. Who would honour with this denomination one who, in tranſlating Scripture, ſhould render συμφωνια *ſymphony*, υπερβολη *hyperbole*, παροξυσμος *paroxyſm*, φαρμακεια *pharmacy*, and συκοφαντειν *to play the ſycophant*, παραδοξα *paradoxes*, ιδιωτης *idiot?* Yet ſome of the conſecrated words have no better title to this diſtinction.

I once met with a criticiſm, I do not remember where, on a paſſage in the Epiſtle of James (*h*), in which God is called the *Father of lights*, παρ ω ουκ ενι παραλλαγη, η τροπης αποσκιασμα. The critic profoundly ſuppoſes, that the ſacred penman, though writing to the Chriſtian converts of the diſperſed Jews, amongſt whom there certainly were not many noble, or rich, or learned, addreſſed them in the language of Aſtronomy; and therefore renders παραλλαγη *parallax*, and τροπη *tropic*. If this be to tranſlate very literally, it is alſo to tranſlate very abſurdly. And ſurely the plea is not ſtronger, that is urged in favour of thoſe interpreters who, without regard to uſage in their own

(*e*) Acts, iii. 17, 18.
(*f*) John, xvi. 25.
(*g*) Mark, iv. 22.
(*h*) James, i. 17.

own language, ſcrupulouſly exhibit, in their verſions, the etymologies of their author's words, eſpecially compound words. Such, if they would preſerve conſiſtency, ought to tranſlate εὐθης *well-bred*, ραδιεργια *eaſy work*, σπερμολογος *ſeed-gatherer*, παντεργος *all-working*, γλωσσοκομον *tongue-caſe*, and παμπολυς *all-many*. The ſimilar attempts of ſome, at analyſing phraſes, or idiomatical expreſſions, in their verſion, which are but a looſer ſort of compoſition, fall under the ſame denomination. Both the above methods, though differing greatly from each other, are occaſionally patronized, as literal, by the ſame perſons. There is a third particular, which is conſidered as, perhaps, more eſſential to this mode of interpreting, than either of the former, and which conſiſts in tracing as nearly as poſſible, in the verſion, the conſtruction and arrangement of the original. This, if not carried to exceſs, is leſs exceptionable than either of the former.

§ 29. BUT, it deſerves our notice, that tranſlators attempting, in this way, to keep cloſely to the letter, have ſometimes failed, through their attending more to words and particles, conſidered ſeparately, than to the combination and conſtruction of the whole ſentence. Thus, the words of our Lord (*i*), πας γαρ ὁ αιτων λαμβανει, και ὁ ζητων ευρισκει, as rendered in the common thranſlation, *For every one that aſketh receiveth; and he that ſeeketh, findeth;* err in this very way. ὁ ζητων ευρισκει, taken by itſelf as a ſeparate ſentence, cannot be better rendered than *he that ſeeketh, findeth.* But in this paſſage it is only a clauſe of a ſentence. The words πας γαρ, wherewith the ſentence begins, relate equally to both clauſes. The verſion here given, *For whoſoever aſketh, obtaineth; whoſoever ſeeketh, findeth*, is, in fact, therefore more cloſe to the letter as well as to the ſenſe: for, by the ſyntactic order, the ſecond clauſe evidently is πας ὁ ζητων ευρισκει. The Vulgate is both literal and juſt, *Omnis enim qui petit, accipit; et qui quærit, invenit.* Here *omnis*, like πας, belongs to both members. Had our tranſlators, in the ſame manner, ſaid *Every one that aſketh, receiveth; and that ſeeketh, findeth;* leaving out the pronoun *he*, they would have done juſtice both to the form and to the ſenſe. But they have choſen rather to follow Beza, who ſays, *Quiſquis enim petit, accipit; et qui quærit, invenit;* where, though the ſecond member is the ſame as in the Vulgate, the expreſſion in the Goſpel is in effect differently tranſlated, as *quiſquis* cannot, like *omnis*, be ſupplied before *qui*. I acknowledge that there is not a material difference in meaning. Only the ſecond clauſe in Beza is expreſſed more weakly, and appears not to affirm ſo univerſally as the firſt clauſe. The clauſe, as expreſſed in Greek, has no ſuch appearance.

§ 30. FOR a ſimilar reaſon, the words ὁπου ὁ σκωληξ αυτων ου τελευτα, και το πυρ αυτων ου σβεννυται (*k*), are, in my opinion, more ſtrictly rendered, *where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched*, than as in the common verſion, *the fire is not quenched.* The manner in which the clauſes are here connected, rendered the repetition of the pronoun in the ſecond clauſe unneceſſary, becauſe in Greek it is in ſuch caſes underſtood as repeated. Whereas in Engliſh, when *the fire* is ſaid, the pronoun cannot be underſtood. It is excluded by the article, which is never by us joined with the poſſeſſive pronoun. Could we, with propriety, imitate the Greek manner entirely, making the perſonal pronoun ſupply the poſſeſſive, and ſaying, *where the worm of them dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*, the pronoun might be underſtood in Engliſh as well as in Greek. But ſuch an idiom with us would be harſh and unnatural. It gives an additional probability to this explanation, that in the paſſage in the Old Teſtament referred to (*l*), it is expreſsly *their fire* as well as *their worm*. In Hebrew the affixes are never left to be ſupplied. This remark regards only the exhibition of the conſtruction, for the ſenſe is not affected by the difference.

§ 31. THE words of John, ὁ ποιων την δικαιοσυνην δικαιος εστι, καθως εκεινος δικαιος εστι (*m*), are, in my judgment, more literally rendered, 'He that doth 'righteouſneſs is righteous, even as God is righteous,' than as it ſtands in the Engliſh tranſlation, 'even as 'he is righteous.' The Engliſh pronoun *he* does not correſpond to the Greek εκεινος ſo ſituated. In Engliſh the ſentence appears to moſt readers a mere identical propoſition: in Greek it has no ſuch appearance, εκεινος plainly referring us to a remote antecedent. As no pronoun in our language will here anſwer the purpoſe, the only proper recourſe is to the noun whoſe place it occupies. The intention of the three examples juſt now given, is to ſhow that, when the conſtruction of the ſentence is taken into the account, that is often found a more literal (if by this be meant *cloſer*) tranſlation, which, to a ſuperficial view, appears leſs ſo.

§ 32. I SHALL here take notice of another caſe in which we may tranſlate literally, nay, juſtly and perſpicuouſly, and yet fail greatly in reſpect of

(*i*) Matth. vii. 8. See the note on that verſe.
(*k*) Mark, ix. 44. 46. 48,
(*l*) Iſaiah, lxvi. 24.
(*m*) 1 John, iii. 7.

energy. This ariſes from not attending to the minute, but often important, differences in ſtructure, between the language of the original and that of the verſion. Of many ſuch differences between Greek and Engliſh, I ſhall mention at preſent only one. We find it neceſſary to introduce ſome of the perſonal pronouns almoſt as often as we introduce a verb. Not only does our idiom require this, but our want of inflections conſtrains us to take this method for conveying the meaning. In the ancient languages this is quite unneceſſary, as the inflection of the verb, in almoſt every caſe, virtually expreſſes the pronoun. There are certain caſes, nevertheleſs, wherein the pronoun is alſo employed in thoſe languages. But in thoſe caſes it has, for the moſt part, an emphaſis which the correſponding pronoun with us, becauſe equally neceſſary in every caſe, is not fitted for expreſſing. Thus our Lord ſays to his diſciples (*n*), Ουχ ὑμεις με εξελεξασθε, αλλ' εγω εξελεξαμην ὑμας, which is rendered in the common verſion, "Ye have not choſen me, but I have choſen you." This verſion is at once literal, juſt, and perſpicuous; yet it has not the energy of the original. The ſtreſs laid on ὑμεις and εγω, which are here contraſted with manifeſt intention, becauſe the words are otherwiſe ſuperfluous, is but feebly, if at all, repreſented by the pronouns *ye* and *I*, which are, in Engliſh, neceſſary attendants on the verbs. Our tranſlators could not have rendered differently, had the words been Ου με εξελεξασθε, αλλ' εξελεξαμην ὑμας. Yet every reader of taſte will perceive that this expreſſion is not nearly ſo emphatical. I might add that ſuch a reader will be ſenſible, that even ſo ſlight a circumſtance as beginning the ſentence with the negative particle, adds to the emphaſis, and that ὑμεις κ would not have been ſo expreſſive as κχ ὑμεις. To do juſtice, therefore, to the energy, as well as to the ſenſe of the original, it is neceſſary, in modern languages, to give the ſentence a different turn. The Port Royal, and after them Simon, and other French tranſlators, have done this ſucceſsfully by rendering it, "Ce n'eſt pas "vous qui m'avez choſi, mais c'eſt moi qui vous ai "choiſi." The like turn has been given by ſome very properly to the words in Engliſh, "It was not "you who choſe me, but it was I who choſe you."

I recollect one inſtance in the Old Teſtament, wherein our tranſlators have taken this method. Joſeph, after he had diſcovered himſelf to his brethren, obſerving that the remembrance of their guilt overwhelmed them with terror and confuſion; in order to compoſe their ſpirits, ſays to them (*o*), "It was not you that ſent me hither, but God." The expreſſion in the Greek tranſlation is perfectly ſimilar to that above quoted from the Goſpel. Ουχ ὑμεις με απεστειλατε ὡδε, αλλ' ὁ Θεος. In the original Hebrew it is not leſs ſo: לא אתכם שלחתם. I do not ſay, however, that the pronoun, when mentioned, is in every caſe emphatical, or that, in every caſe, it would be proper to deviate from the more ſimple manner of tranſlating.

§ 33. Thus much ſhall ſuffice for what regards thoſe leading rules in tranſlating, which may be judged neceſſary for ſecuring propriety, perſpicuity, and energy; and, as far as poſſible, in a conſiſtency with theſe, for doing juſtice to the particular manner of the author tranſlated; and for beſtowing on the whole that ſimple kind of decoration, which is ſuited to its character. This finiſhes the firſt part of this Diſſertation relating to the matter or principal qualities to be attended to in tranſlating.

(*n*) John, xv. 16.

(*o*) Geneſis, xlv. 8.

PART

PART II.

The Readings of the Original here followed.

I SHALL now ſubjoin a few remarks on the readings, where there is, in the original, a diverſity of reading, which are here preferred.

Were it in our power to recur to the autographies of the ſacred penmen, that is to the manuſcripts written by themſelves, or by thoſe whom they employed, to whom they dictated, and whoſe work they ſuperviſed, there could be no queſtion that we ought to recur to them, as the only infallible ſtandards of divine truth. But thoſe identical writings, it is acknowledged on all hands are nowhere now to be found. What we have, in their ſtead, are the copies of copies (through how many ſucceſſions, it is impoſſible to ſay), which were originally taken from thoſe autographies. Now, though Chriſtians are generally agreed in aſcribing infallibility to the ſacred penmen, no Chriſtian ſociety, or individual, that I know, has ever yet aſcribed infallibility to the copiers of the New Teſtament. Indeed, ſome Chriſtians appear abſurd enough to admit thus much in favour of thoſe who have tranſcribed the Old Teſtament; about which they ſeem to imagine, that Providence has been more ſolicitous than about the New. For, in regard to the New Teſtament; nothing of this kind has ever been advanced. Now, what has been ſaid of the tranſcribers of the New Teſtament may, with equal certainty, be affirmed of the editors and printers. It is, nevertheleſs, true that ſince the invention of printing, we have greater ſecurity than formerly, againſt that incorrectneſs which multiplies the diverſities of reading; inaſmuch as now, a whole printed edition, conſiſting of many thouſand copies, is not expoſed to ſo many errors, as a ſingle written copy was before. But this invention is comparatively modern. Beſides, the effect it had, in point of correctneſs, was only to check the progreſs, or, more properly, to prevent the encreaſe of the evil, by giving little ſcope for new variations. But it could have no retroſpective effect in rectifying thoſe already produced.

§ 2. It behoved the firſt editors of the New Teſtament in print, to employ the manuſcripts of which they were poſſeſſed, with all their imperfections. And who will pretend that cardinal Ximenes, Eraſmus, Robert Stephens, and the other early publiſhers of the New Teſtament, to whom the republic of letters is indeed much indebted, were under an infallible direction in the choice of manuſcripts, or in the choice of readings in thoſe paſſages wherein their copies differed from one another? That they were not all under infallible guidance, we have ocular demonſtration, as, by comparing them, we ſee that, in many inſtances, they differ among themſelves. And if only one was infallibly directed, which of them, ſhall we ſay, was favoured with this honourable diſtinction? But, in fact, though there are many well-meaning perſons, who appear diſſatisfied with the bare mention of various readings of the ſacred text, and much more with the adoption of any reading to which they have not been accuſtomed, there is no one who has yet ventured to aſcribe infallibility or inſpiration, to any ſucceſſion of copyiſts, editors, or printers. Yet without this, to what purpoſe complain? Is it poſſible to diſſemble a circumſtance clear as day, that different copies read ſome things differently? a circumſtance of which every perſon who, with but a moderate ſhare of knowledge, will take the trouble to reflect, muſt be convinced that it was inevitable? Or, if it were poſſible to diſſemble it, ought this truth to be diſſembled? If, in any inſtance wherein the copies differ, there appear, upon inquiry ſufficient reaſon to believe, that the reading of one copy, or number of copies, is the dictate of inſpiration, and that the reading of the reſt, though the ſame with that of the printed edition moſt in uſe, is not, will the cauſe of truth be better ſerved by diſſimulation, in adhering to a maxim of policy, merely human, or by conveying, in ſimplicity, to the beſt of our power, the genuine ſenſe of the Spirit? The former method favours too much of thoſe pious frauds which, though excellent props to ſuperſtition, in ignorant and barbarous ages, ought never to be employed in the ſervice of true religion. Their aſſiſtance ſhe never needs, and diſdains to uſe. Let us then conclude that, as the ſacred writings have been immenſely multiplied, by the copies which have been taken from the original manuſcripts, and by the tranſcripts ſucceſſively made from the copies; the intruſion of miſtakes into the manuſcripts, and thence into the printed editions, was, without a chain of miracles, abſolutely unavoidable.

§ 3. It may be thought that the tranſmiſſion, through ſo many ages, merely by tranſcribing, in order to ſupply the place of thoſe copies which,

from time to time, have been deſtroyed or loſt, muſt have, long before now, greatly corrupted the text, and involved the whole in uncertainty. Yet, in fact, the danger here is not near ſo great as, at firſt, it would appear. The multiplication of the copies, the very circumſtance which occaſions the increaſe of the evil, has, in a great meaſure, as it began very early, brought its own remedy along with it, namely, the opportunity it affords, of collating thoſe which have been made from different ancient exemplars. For, let it be obſerved, that different tranſcribers from a correct ſtandard, rarely fall into the ſame errors. If, therefore, which is highly probable, as almoſt all thoſe writings were originally intended for the uſe of multitudes, ſeveral copies were made directly from the writings of the ſacred penmen, thoſe tranſcripts, when the common archetype was loſt, would ſerve, when collated to correct one another: and, in like manner, the copies taken from one, would ſerve to correct the copies taken from another. There are ſeveral conſiderations, ariſing from external circumſtances, from which, among the different readings of different manuſcripts, the preference may, with probability, be determined; ſuch are the comparative antiquity, number, and apparent accuracy of the copies themſelves. There are conſiderations, alſo, ariſing from internal qualities in the readings compared; ſuch as, conformity to the grammatical conſtruction, to the common idiom of the language, to the ſpecial idiom of the Helleniſts, to the manner of the writer, and to the ſcope of the context. Need I ſubjoin the judgments that may be formed, by a ſmall change in the pointing, or even in dividing the words? for, in theſe things, the critic is entitled to ſome latitude, as, in the moſt ancient manuſcripts, there were neither points nor accents, and hardly a diviſion of the words.

Next to the aid of manuſcripts, is that of the Greek commentators, who give us, in their commentaries, the text, as they found it at the time; and, next to this, we have that of ancient tranſlations. I do not mean the aid they give for diſcovering the import of the original terms; for, in this reſpect, modern verſions may be equally profitable; but, their leading to the diſcovery of a different reading in the manuſcripts from which they were made. In this way, modern verſions are of no uſe to the critic, the world being ſtill in poſſeſſion of their originals. Next to ancient tranſlations, though very far from being of equal weight, are the quotations made by the Fathers, and early eccleſiaſtical writers. Of the degrees of regard due, reſpectively, to the ſeveral aſſiſtances above named, it would be ſuperfluous here to diſcourſe, after what has been written by Walton, Mill, Wetſtein, Simon, Michaelis, Kennicott, and many others. As we can aſcribe to no manuſcript, edition, or tranſlation, abſolute perfection; we ought to follow none of them implicitly. As little ought we to reject the aid of any. On theſe principles I have proceeded in this verſion. Even the Engliſh tranſlators have not ſcrupled in a few inſtances, to prefer a manuſcript reading to that of the priuted editions, and the reading of the Vulgate to that of the Greek. Of the former, I remember two examples (*p*) in the Goſpels, wherein our tranſlators have adopted a reading different from the reading of the common Greek, and alſo different from that of the Vulgate; and not a few (*q*), wherein they have preferred the latter to the former, ſometimes, in my opinion, raſhly. The paſſages are mentioned in the margin; the reader may compare them at his leiſure, and conſult the notes relating to them, ſubjoined to this tranſlation.

§ 4. BENGELIUS, though he conſulted manuſcripts, declares, that he has followed none in the edition he has given of the New Teſtament, unleſs where they ſupported the reading of ſome one, at leaſt, of the printed editions. "This," ſays Bowyer (*r*), "is the "greateſt deference that was ever paid to the preſs." But, with all due reſpect to the judgment of that worthy and learned printer, I do not think it evidence of a deference to the preſs, but of an extravagant deference to the firſt editors of the ſacred books in print. The Scriptures of the New Teſtament had been conveyed, by manuſcript, for about fourteen hundred years before the art of printing exiſted. As it has never been pretended that the firſt printers, or the firſt publiſhers, were inſpired, or ought to be put on the footing of Prophets, we conclude, that if their editions contain things not warranted by the manuſcripts or ancient verſions then extant, ſuch things muſt be erroneous, or, at leaſt, apocryphal. And, if every thing they contain may be found in ſome manuſcripts or verſions of an older date, though not in all, our giving ſuch a preference to the readings copied into the printed editions, can proceed from nothing but a blind deference to the judgment of thoſe editors, as always ſelecting the beſt. Whether they merited this diſtinction, the judicious and impartial will judge. But no reaſonable perſon can heſitate a moment to pronounce, that if, of all the readings they had met with,

(*p*) Matth. x. 10. John, xviii. 20.
(*q*) Matth. xii. 14. xxv. 39. xxvi. 15. Mark, vi. 56. Luke, i. 35. ii. 22. xi. 13. John, xvi. 2. xviii. 1. 15.
(*r*) Pref. to his Critical Conjectures.

with, they had ſelected the worſt, the preſs would have conveyed them down to us with equal fidelity. We may then have a prejudice in favour of the printed editions, becauſe we are accuſtomed to them, but have no valid reaſon for preferring them to manuſcripts, unleſs it ariſe from a well-founded preference of the firſt editors of the New Teſtament, to all other ſcriptural critics, as men who had the beſt means of knowing what was preferable in the manuſcripts, and who were the moſt capable of making a proper choice. But hardly will either be admitted by thoſe who are acquainted with the ſtate of this ſpecies of literature, at that time and ſince.

§ 5. THOUGH not the firſt publiſhed, the firſt prepared for publication, was the Complutenſian Polyglot, by cardinal Ximenes, a Spaniard. The ſentence, formerly quoted from him, relating to the place he had aſſigned the Vulgate in his edition, between the Hebrew and the Greek, and his indecent compariſon of its appearance there, to our Lord crucified between the two malefactors, do not ſerve to raiſe our opinion, either of his judgment, or of his impartiality. He boaſted of the uſe he had made of the Vatican, and other manuſcripts of great antiquity as to which Wetſtein is not ſingular in expreſſing doubts of his veracity.

Eraſmus is conſidered as the ſecond editor. His New Teſtament was publiſhed, but not printed, before the Complutenſian. He made uſe of ſome manuſcripts of Bazil, and others, which he had collected in different parts; but he was ſo little ſcrupulous, in regard to the text, that what was ineligible in the only Greek copy, he ſeems to have had, of the Acpocalypſe, he ſupplied, by tranſlating back into Greek from the Vulgate. He publiſhed ſeveral editions of this work, the two or three laſt of which he brought to a greater conformity to the Complutenſian printed at Alcala, than his three firſt were.

The third editor, of note (for I paſs over thoſe who did little other than republiſh either Ximenes or Eraſmus), was Robert Stephens. He allowed himſelf, in a great meaſure, to be directed by the two former editors; but not without uſing, on ſeveral occaſions, the readings which he found in ſome of the beſt manuſcripts he had collected. Many of the later editions of the New Teſtament are formed from ſome of his.

Beza, indeed, who was himſelf poſſeſſed of ſome valuable manuſcripts, and was ſupplied, by Henry Stephens, with the various readings which had been collected by his father, ſometimes introduced them into the text. But his choice was directed by no principle of criticiſm. His great rule of preference (as might be expected from the manner in which he conducted his tranſlation), was conformity to his own theological ſyſtem. This led him to introduce variations, ſometimes on the authority of a ſingle manuſcript of little or no account, ſometimes without even that, inſomuch that ſeveral of his alterations muſt be conſidered as conjectural. Yet his edition has been much followed by Proteſtants. Cruſelleus (*s*) complains of him for having, by his own acknowledgment, ſuppreſſed many readings he was poſſeſſed of. Simon takes notice of the ſame thing (*t*). And, it muſt be owned, that Beza's conduct, in other particulars, gives ground to ſuſpect, that his impartiality, in a matter of this kind, was not to be relied on.

The only other editor I know, who has had recourſe to gueſſing, for the improvement of the text, is the Engliſh tranſlator in 1729, often before mentioned. He has, along with his verſion, republiſhed the Greek text, corrected, as he pretends, from authentic manuſcripts. It does not, however, appear, that he has been guided by critical principles, in judging of manuſcripts, or of the preference due to particular readings. His chief rule ſeems to have been their conformity to his own notion, which has led him to employ a boldneſs in correcting altogether unwarrantable.

§ 6. WHAT follows may ſerve as evidence of this. Dr. Mill was ſo much pleaſed with a correction propoſed by Bentley (*u*), as to ſay, "Mihi tantopere "placet hæc lectio, ut abſque unanimi codicum in "altera iſta lectione conſenſu, genuinam eam intre- "pidè pronunciarem:" to which our editor gives this brief and contemptuous reply,—"As if there "was any manuſcript ſo old as COMMON SENSE." The greateſt regard is doubtleſs due to *common ſenſe*; but, where the ſubject is matter of fact, the proper province of common ſenſe, lies in comparing and judging the proofs brought before it, not in ſupplying from invention any deficiency in theſe. Common ſenſe, or rather reaſon, is the judge in the trial. Manuſcripts, verſions, quotations, &c. are the teſtimonies. It would be a bad ſcheme in civil matters to ſuperſede the examination of witneſſes, on pretence that the ſagacity of the judge rendered it unneceſſary. Yet it might be pretended, that his penetration is ſuch, that he can diſcover at a glance the

(*s*) Pref. to his edition of the N. T. Neſcio quo conſilio, plurimas quas præ manibus habebat, publico inviderit.
(*t*) Hiſt. Crit. du N. T. lib. ii. cap. 29.
(*u*) The paſſage, on which the correction was propoſed, is Gal. iv. 25.

the truth or the falſity of the charge, from the bare phyſiognomy of the parties. But can ye imagine, that people would think their lives, liberties, and properties, ſecure in a country, where this were the method of trial? Or will this method, think ye, be found to anſwer better in critical, than in judicial matters? If, under the name of COMMON SENSE, we ſubſtitute the critic's fancy, in the room of teſtimony and all external evidence; we ſhall find that we have eſtabliſhed a teſt of criticiſm which is infinitely various, not in different ſects only, but in different individuals. The common ſenſe of the aforeſaid Engliſh editor, and the common ſenſe of Beza (yet neither of them was deſtitute of this quality), would, I am afraid, have not very often coincided.

§ 7. SHALL we then ſet aſide reaſon or common ſenſe in ſuch enquiries? On the contrary, no ſtep can properly be taken without it. The judge is neceſſary in the trial; ſo are the witneſſes: but there will be an end of all fairneſs, and an introduction to the moſt arbitrary proceedings, if the former be made to ſupply the place of both. In caſes of this kind we ought always to remember that the queſtion, wherever any doubt ariſes, is a queſtion of fact, not a queſtion of right, or of abſtract truth. It is, 'What was ſaid;' not 'What 'ſhould have been ſaid;' or, 'What we ourſelves 'would have ſaid,' had we been in the author's place. This is what we never miſtake in the explanation of any Pagan writer, or of any modern, but are very apt to miſtake in the explanation of the Bible. If a Chriſtian of judgment and knowledge were tranſlating the Alcoran, there would be no riſk of his confounding things ſo manifeſtly diſtinct. The reaſon is, ſuch a tranſlator's concern would only be to give the meaning of his author, without either inquiring or minding whether it were agreeable or contray to his own ſentiments.

Whereas, it is a thouſand to one that the Chriſtian, of whatever denomination he be, has, previouſly to his entering on the interpretation, gotten a ſet of opinions concerning thoſe points about which Scripture is converſant. As theſe opinions have acquired a certain firmneſs through habit, and as a believer in Chriſtianity cannot conſiſtently maintain tenets which he ſees to be repugnant to the doctrines contained in Scripture, he will find it eaſier (unleſs poſſeſſed of an uncommon ſhare of candour and diſcernment) to bring, by his ingenuity, (eſpecially when aided by conjectural emendations) the dictates of revelation to a conformity to his opinions, than to bring his opinions to a conformity to the dictates of revelation. This tendency is the real cauſe of ſo much ſtraining as is ſometimes to be found in the manner of criticiſing holy writ; ſtraining, let me add, to a degree which we never ſee exemplified in intepreting any claſſical author. In the latter we are comparatively little intereſted, and are therefore ready to admit, on many occaſions, that ſuch are the ſentiments expreſſed in his writings, though very different from our ſentiments. But as Chriſtians will not admit this with regard to the Bible, they have often no other reſource, but either to wreſt its words or to change their own opinions. Which of theſe ways will be oftner taken, it is not difficult to ſay.

§ 8. I have often wiſhed (if ſuch a perſon could be found) that an infidel of ſufficient learning, penetration, coolneſs, and candour, would, merely for the ſake of illuſtrating what muſt be allowed to be curious pieces of ancient literature, undertake the tranſlation of the ſacred books. Such a man would have no bias upon his mind to induce him to wreſt the words, in order to make them ſpeak his own ſentiments. And if he had the genuine ſpirit of the philoſopher, hiſtorian, or antiquary, he would be ſolicitous to exhibit the manners, opinions, cuſtoms, and reaſonings of thoſe early ages fairly, as he found them, without adding any thing of his own, either to exalt or to depreſs the original. I ſhould not think it impoſſible to find ſo much fairneſs in a Chriſtian who, having reſided long in India, and underſtood their ſacred language, ſhould undertake to tranſlate to us the Scriptures of the Bramins; but ſuch impartiality in an infidel living in a Chriſtian country, would be, I fear, a chimerical expectation.

There is, however, I acknowledge, a conſiderable difference in the caſes. We view with different eyes the opinions of remote ages and diſtant nations, from thoſe wherewith we contemplate the ſentiments of the times in which, and the people amongſt whom, we live. The obſervation of our Lord (*x*) holds invariably, 'He who is not for us, is againſt us; and he who gathereth not with us, ſcattereth.' We find no examples of neutrality in this cauſe. Whoever is not a friend is an enemy; and for this reaſon, without any violation of charity, we may conclude that the interpretation of Scripture is ſafer in the hands of the bigoted ſectary, than in thoſe of the opinionative infidel, whoſe underſtanding is blinded by the moſt inflexible and the moſt unjuſt of all paſſions, an inveterate contempt. Hatred, when alone, may be prevailed on to enquire, and, in conſequence of enquiry, may be ſurmounted; but when hatred

(*x*) Matth. xii. 30.

hatred is accompanied with contempt, it ſpurns enquiry as ridiculous.

§ 9. But, it may be ſaid, though this may be juſtly applied to the confirmed infidel, it is not applicable to the ſceptic, who, becauſe he finds difficulties on both ſides of the queſtion which he is not able to ſurmount, is perplexed with doubts in relation to it. I am ſenſible of the difference, and readily admit that what I ſaid of the infidel, does not apply to the laſt mentioned character. At the ſame time I muſt obſerve, that thoſe juſt now deſcribed appear to be a very ſmall number, and are not the people whom the world at preſent commonly calls ſceptics. This, on the contrary, like the term free-thinker, is become merely a ſofter and more fashionable name for infidel; for, on all thoſe points wherein the ſceptics of the age differ from Chriſtians, they will be found to the full as dogmatical as the moſt tenacious of their adverſaries (*y*). Such, at leaſt, is the manner of thoſe who, in modern Europe, affect to be conſidered as philoſophical ſceptics.

§ 10. But, to return to the conſideration of the firſt printed editions, from which it may be thought I have digreſſed too far: what has been ſaid ſufficiently ſhows that they are not entitled to more credit than is due to the manuſcripts from which they were compiled. Nobody aſcribes inſpiration, or any ſupernatural direction, to the firſt editors. And as to advantages merely natural, they were not on an equal footing with the critics of after-times. The moſt valuable manuſcripts, far from being generally known, remained ſcattered throughout the world. A few might fall under the notice of one curious enquirer, another few under that of another. But there had not been any number of them yet collated, and conſequently their various readings had not been collected and publiſhed. Nay that the judgment of thoſe editors, concerning the antiquity and correctneſs of the manuſcripts which they uſed, cannot be implicitly relied on, may warrantably be concluded from this circumſtance, that this ſpecies of criticiſm was but in its infancy, and that even learned men had not then, as now, the neceſſary means of qualifying themſelves for judging of the antiquity and correctneſs of manuſcripts. Beſides, thoſe publiſhers themſelves were not unanimous. Nor were the alterations made by thoſe of them who were poſterior in time, always for the better. "I am amazed," ſays Michaelis (*z*), very juſtly, "when I hear ſome vindicate "our common readings, as if the editors had been "inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt."

Is it poſſible then to aſſign a ſatisfactory reaſon for the determination of Bengelius, not to admit any reading which had not the ſupport of ſome former printed edition? "Ne ſyllabam quidem, etiamſi "mille MSS. mille critici juberent, antehac [in edi-"tionibus] non receptam, adducar ut recipiam (*a*)." He has not indeed confined himſelf, in his choice of readings, to any one edition, but has excluded entirely from his text, thoſe readings which, however well ſupported, no preceding editor had adopted. This rule which he laid down to himſelf, is manifeſtly indefenſible, inaſmuch as the authority of the printed editions muſt ultimately reſt on that of the manuſcripts from which they are taken. Whereas it can give no additional value to the manuſcripts, that ſome of the firſt publiſhers have thought fit to prefer them, perhaps injudiciouſly, to others; or, to ſpeak more properly, have thought fit to copy them as the beſt they had. Their merit depends entirely on the evidences we have of their own antiquity, accuracy, &c. For none, ſurely, will be hardy enough to ſay, that errors, by being printed, will be converted into truths.

§ 11. The only cauſe which I can aſſign, for the reſolution taken by Bengelius, though of no weight in the ſcales of criticiſm and philoſophy, may merit ſome regard, viewed in a prudential and political light. The printed copies are in every body's hands; the manuſcripts are known to very few: and

(*y*) The only exception which has appeared in this age (if we can account one an exception who has done ſo much to undermine in others a belief, with which at times he ſeems himſelf to have been ſtrongly impreſſed) is that eminent but anomalous genius, Rouſſeau. He had the ſenſibility to feel ſtrongly, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, the force of the internal evidence of our religion reſulting from the character, the life and the death, of its Author, the purity and the ſublimity of his inſtructions; he had the ſagacity to diſcern, and the candour to acknowledge, that the methods employed by infidels in accounting for theſe things are frivolous, and, to every rational enquirer, unſatisfactory. At the ſame time, through the unhappy influence of philoſophical prejudices, inſenſible of the force of the external evidence of prophecy and miracles, he did not ſcruple to treat every plea of this kind as abſurd, employing againſt the ſame religion, even the pooreſt cavils that are anywhere to be found in the writings of infidels. Nay, for this purpoſe, he muſtered up a world of objections, without ever diſcovering that he miſtook the ſubject of diſpute, and confounded the doctrine of particular ſects or denominations of Chriſtians with the doctrine of Chriſt. The articles againſt which his artillery is generally pointed, are the comments of later ages and not the pure dictates of holy writ. See the character of this extraordinary man (whom I here conſider only as a ſceptic) as delineated by the maſterly pen of Dr. Beattie, Eſſay on Truth, Part III. chap. 2.

(*z*) Introduc. Lect. ſect. 34. (*a*) Prodromus.

and though the eaſy multiplication of the copies, by the preſs, will not be conſidered, by any perſon who reflects, as adding any authority to the manuſcripts from which they were taken, it has, nevertheleſs, the ſame effect on the generality of mankind. Cuſtom, the duration and the extent of their reception, are powerful ſupports with the majority of readers. The reaſon, therefore, which has influenced that learned editor, is, at bottom, I ſuppoſe, the ſame that influenced Jerom, when reviſing the old Latin verſion, not to correct every thing which he was ſenſible ſtood in need of correction, that he might not by the number and boldneſs of his alterations, ſcandalize the people. But this is a motive of a kind totally different from thoſe which ariſe from critical conſiderations, and ought not to be confounded with them.

§ 12. I DO not mean to ſay, that this is a motive to which no regard ſhould be ſhown. There are two caſes in which, in my opinion, it ought to determine the preference; firſt, when the arguments in favour of one reading, appear exactly balanced by thoſe in favour of another; ſecondly, when the difference in reading cannot be ſaid to affect either the ſenſe or the perſpicuity of the ſentence. In the former caſe, when no better rule of deciſion can be diſcovered, it is but reaſonable, that cuſtom ſhould be allowed to decide. In the latter, as we ought to avoid, eſpecially in a verſion, introducing alterations of no ſignificance, it might juſtly be accounted trifling, to take notice of ſuch differences. In other caſes, we ought to be determined by the rules of criticiſm; that is, in other words, by the evidence impartially examined. As to which, I ſhall only add, that though much regard is due to the number of manuſcripts, editions, verſions, &c. yet, in aſcertaining the preference, we ought not to be determined ſolely by the circumſtance of number. The teſtimony of a few credible witneſſes, outweighs that of many who are of doubtful character. Beſides, there are generally internal marks of credibility or incredibility, in the thing teſtified, which ought always to have ſome influence on the deciſion.

§ 13. AT the ſame time, I cannot help diſapproving the admiſſion of any correction (where the expreſſion, as it ſtands in the text, is not downright nonſenſe), merely on conjecture: for were ſuch a method of correcting to be generally adopted, no bound could be ſet to the freedom which would be uſed with ſacred writ. We ſhould very ſoon ſee it a perfect Babel in language, as various in its ſtyle, in different editions, as are the dialects of our different ſects and parties. This is an extreme which, if it ſhould prevail, would be of much more pernicious conſequence than the other extreme, of adhering implicitly and inflexibly, with or without reaſon, to whatever we find in the common edition. We know the worſt of this error already; and we can ſay with aſſurance that, though the common editions are not perfect, there is no miſtake in them of ſuch a nature, as materially to affect either the doctrines to be believed, or the duties to be practiſed, by a Chriſtian. The worſt conſequences, which the blunders of tranſcribers have occaſioned, are their hurting ſometimes the perſpicuity, ſometimes the credibility of holy writ, affording a handle to the objections of infidels, and thereby weakening the evidences of religion. But, as to the extreme of correcting on mere conjecture, its tendency is manifeſtly to throw every thing looſe, and to leave all at the mercy of ſyſtem-builders, and framers of hypotheſes; for who ſhall give law to the licentiouſneſs of gueſſing?

It is not enough to anſwer, that the claſſics have ſometimes been corrected on conjecture. The caſes are not parallel. A freedom may be taken with the latter with approbation, which cannot, with propriety, be taken with the former (*b*). Houbigant, though

(*b*) Part I. § 21. Since theſe Diſſertations were written, I have ſeen Dr. Geddis' PROSPECTUS, wherein, among many things which I entirely approve, I obſerved the following words (p. 55.), which appear to ſtand in direct contradiction to the opinion given above: "When the corruptions of the text cannot be removed, either by the collation of manuſcripts, or "the aid of verſions, internal analogy, or external teſtimony, the laſt reſource is conjectural criticiſm." In oppoſition to this doctrine, he produces a popular objection, which he examines and anſwers. And in this anſwer he goes ſtill further, affirming that there are caſes in which the text may be reſtored by *mere critical conjecture*. I have attentively conſidered his anſwer, and am led by it to regret that, through the imperfection of all languages, ancient and modern, it often happens that writers agree in ſentiments who differ in words, and agree in words who differ in ſentiments. Though that author and I have, on this head, expreſſed ourſelves very differently, I am apt to conclude, from the explanation he has given, the inſtances he has produced, and the canons he has laid down, that the difference between us is moſtly, if not entirely, verbal. It lies chiefly in the ſenſe affixed to the word *conjecture*. He has applied it to caſes to which I ſhould not think it applicable. When any paſſage contains in itſelf ſuch indications, as are always accounted ſufficient evidence of a particular alteration it has undergone, I never call the diſcovery of that alteration conjecture.

Now this is preciſely the caſe in ſome of the inſtances given by Dr. Geddis. When, in one edition of the Engliſh Bible, we read *to ad dafflidion to my bonds*, how do we reaſon from it? We perceive at once that *ad* is not Engliſh, neither is *dafflidion*. Hence we conclude, with perfect aſſurance, that this is not the true reading, or the reading intended by the tranſlators. A very little attention ſhows us that if, without altering the order of the letters, we take the *d* from the beginning of *dafflidion*, and

though a critic of eminence in Oriental literature, and a good tranſlator, has, in my judgment, taken moſt unjuſtifiable liberties in his conjectural emendations, and has been but too much followed by critics, commentators, or paraphraſts, amongſt ourſelves. I am far from thinking that, in ſome of his gueſſes, he may not be right; it is, however, much more probable that, in the greater part of them, he is wrong.

A mere conjecture may be mentioned in a note; but if, without the authority of copies, tranſlations, or ancient eccleſiaſtical writers, it may be admitted into the text, there is an end of all reliance on the Scriptures as the dictates of the divine ſpirit. Manuſcripts, ancient tranſlations, the readings of the moſt early commentators, are like the witneſſes in a judicial proceſs, direct evidence in this matter. The reaſonings of conjecturers are but like the ſpeeches of the pleaders. To receive, on the credit of a ſagacious conjecture, a reading not abſolutely neceſſary to the conſtruction, and quite unſupported by poſitive evidence, appears not leſs incongruous, than it would be, in a trial, to return a verdict, founded on the pleading of a plauſible ſpeaker, not only without proof, but in direct oppoſition to it. For, let it be obſerved, that the copies, ancient verſions, and quotations, which are conformable to the common reading, are poſitive evidence in its favour, and therefore againſt the conjecture. And even, if the readings of the paſſage be various, there is, though leſs, ſtill ſome weight in their evidence againſt a reading merely conjectural, and, conſequently, deſtitute of external ſupport, and different from them all. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the variety itſelf, if it affect ſome of the oldeſt manuſcripts and tranſlations, is a preſumption that the place has been early corrupted in tranſcribing.

§ 14. I CANNOT avoid, here, taking notice of a correction, merely conjectural, propoſed by the late Dr. Kennicott, a man to whoſe pious and uſeful labours, the learned in general, and the ſtudents of the divine oracles in particular, are under the greateſt obligations. The correction he propoſes (*c*), is on theſe words, ויתן את רשעים קברו ואת עשיר במתיו E. T. "And he made his grave with the wicked, and with "the rich in his death (*d*). This ingenious critic ſuppoſes, that the words קברו and במתיו have, by ſome means or other, changed places. He would have them, therefore, tranſpoſed, or rather reſtored, each to its proper place, in conſequence of which, the import will be (I give it in his own words), 'And he was taken up with the wicked men in his 'death; and with a rich man was his ſepulchre.' He adds: "Since the preceding parts of the pro-"phecy ſpeak ſo indiſputably of the ſufferings and "death of the Meſſiah, theſe words ſeem evidently "meant as deſcriptive of the Meſſiah's being put to

and annex it to *ad* immediately preceding (which is the ſmalleſt alteration poſſible), the expreſſion is juſt in itſelf, and the meaning is ſuited to the context. As it ſtands, it is nonſenſe. No evidence can be more convincing. We may venture to ſay, that if there were fifty other editions of the Engliſh Bible at hand, no reaſonable perſon would think of conſulting any of them for further ſatisfaction. Now I ſubmit it to this critic himſelf, whether to ſay of any thing, "It is a matter of the utmoſt certainty," and to ſay, "It is a mere conjecture," be not conſidered as rather oppoſite in ſignification than coincident. There are ſome other of the learned Gentleman's examples, in which there is hardly more ſcope for conjecture than in that now examined; ſuch as that wherein *teritcd* (which is no word) is uſed for *retired* (a word remarkably ſimilar), and that wherein *well* (which in that place has no meaning) is uſed for *dwell*. In all ſuch caſes we are determined, by the internal evidence reſulting from the ſimilarity of the letters, from the ſcope of the place, and from the conſtruction of the words. In a few of the caſes put, there is, I own, ſomething of conjecture; but the correction is not merely conjectural. Of this kind is that *verſed in the politer of learning*, where *parts* or *branches*, or ſome word of like ſignification, muſt be ſupplied. If it be aſked, What then ought to be denominated a matter of mere conjecture? I anſwer, The reader will find an example of this in § 14. to which I refer him. We have but too many examples in ſome late critical productions of great name, wherein the authors, without any warrant from manuſcripts or verſions, and without any reaſon from the ſcope of the place, or the import of the paſſage, are perpetually propoſing emendations on the text, and that by tranſpoſing, changing, adding, or diſmiſſing, not only words but clauſes, when the paſſage does not, as it ſtands, perfectly ſuit their notions.

That the text has been ſometimes interpolated, and otherwiſe corrupted by tranſcribers and interpreters, cannot be queſtioned. Of this it is doubtleſs the critic's buſineſs to clear it as much as poſſible. But we ought ever to remember, that the greater part of thoſe corruptions were originally no other than conjectural corrections. And if we go to work in the ſame way, with ſuch freedom of gueſſing as has ſometimes been employed, it is ten to one that we ourſelves corrupt the text inſtead of mending it, and that we ſerve only to furniſh more work for future critics. I obſerve in the Monthly Review [Auguſt 1786] of Reed's late edition of Shakeſpeare, in a note on the expreſſion *knowledge illinhabited*, which has given great plague to the critics, the following remark: "At all events we beg leave to enter our proteſt againſt putting *inhibit* into the text. "How many plauſible conjectures, which their ill-adviſed predeceſſors," former publiſhers, "had advanced into the body "of the page, have the late editors, in conſequence of their more extenſive reſearches, been obliged to degrade to their proper "place, the margin? Can they then be too ſcrupulous in admitting their own corrections?" Upon the whole, from the way wherein Dr. Geddis qualifies his ſentiments, I am convinced, that the difference between him and me on this article is more in the words than in the thought. His verdict in regard to every one of the particular caſes, ſuppoſed by him, is unexceptionable: but his manner of expreſſing the general poſition is, in my opinion, unguarded, and conſequently may miſlead.

(*c*) Diſſ. II. chap. IV. 2d period. (*d*) Iſa. liii. 9.

" death in company with wicked men, and making " his grave, or ſepulchre (not with rich men, but) " with one rich man."

Now, let it be obſerved, that of all the vaſt number of manuſcripts which that gentlemen had collated, not one was found to favour this arrangement; that neither the Septuagint, nor any other old tranſlation, is conformable to it; that no ancient author, known to us, in any language, quotes the words, ſo arranged, either from the original, or from any verſion, and, conſequently, that we cannot conſider the conjecture otherwiſe, than as oppoſed by ſuch a cloud of witneſſes as, in enquiries of this kind, muſt be accounted ſtrong poſitive evidence. Had the words, as they are read in Scripture, been ungrammatical, ſo as to yield no meaning, that we could diſcover, and had the tranſpoſition of the two words added both ſenſe and grammar to the ſentence, and that in perfect conſiſtency with the ſcope of the context, I ſhould have readily admitted, that the criticiſm ſtood on a firmer foundation than mere conjecture, and that the external proofs, from teſtimony, might be counterbalanced by the intrinſic evidence ariſing from the ſubject. But this is not pretended here. To be aſſociated with the rich in death, is equally grammatical, and equally intelligible, as to be aſſociated with the wicked; the like may be ſaid in regard to burial. Where, then, is the occaſion for a change? The only anſwer that can be given, is certainly a very bad one. The occaſion is, that the words may be adjuſted to an event which, in our opinion, is the fulfilment of the prophecy.

But, if ſuch liberties may be taken with the Prophets, there will be no difficulty in obtaining, from them, proofs in ſupport of any interpretation. The learned Doctor takes notice, that the preceding part of this chapter ſpeaks indiſputably of the ſufferings and death of the Meſſiah. I am as much convinced as any man, that the ſubject of the prophecy is as he repreſents it; but, to ſay that it is indiſputably ſo, ſeems to inſinuate that it is univerſally admitted. Now this is far from being the fact. It is diſputed by the whole Jewiſh nation, and is allowed, by ſome Chriſtian expoſitors, to be only, in a ſecondary ſenſe, prophetical of Chriſt. Suppoſe a Chriſtian, after the paſſage ſhall have been, in the Chriſtian Bibles, new modelled in the way propoſed, to urge it on a Jew, as an argument from prophecy, that Jeſus, the ſon of Mary, is the perſon in whom the prediction was fulfilled, and therefore the Meſſiah; inaſmuch as the words exactly repreſent what, in ſo ſignal a manner, happened to him.—He ſuffered with malefactors, and was buried in a rich man's ſepulchre; would not the other have reaſon to retort, 'Ye 'Chriſtians have a wonderful dexterity in managing 'the argument from prophecy; ye, firſt, by chang-'ing and tranſpoſing the Prophet's words, accom-'modating them to your purpoſe, make him ſay, 'what we have direct evidence that he never ſaid; 'and then ye have the confidence to argue, this muſt 'infallibly be the event intended by the Prophet, it 'ſo exactly anſwers the deſcription. Ye yourſelves 'make the prophecy reſemble the event which ye 'would have to be predicted by it, and then ye 'reaſon from the reſemblance, that this is the com-'pletion of the prophecy.'

Let us judge equitably of men of all denominations. Should we diſcover that the Maſorets had made ſo free with the declaration of any Prophet, in order to adapt it to what they take to be the accompliſhment; would we heſitate a moment to call the words, ſo metamorphoſed, a corruption of the ſacred text? In an enlightened age, to recur to ſuch expedients, will be always found to hurt true religion, inſtead of promoting it. The detection of them, in a few inſtances, brings a ſuſpicion on the cauſe they were intended to ſerve, and would go far to diſcredit the argument from prophecy altogether. I cannot conclude this remark, without adding, that this is almoſt the only inſtance wherein I differ in critical ſentiments from that excellent author; from whoſe labours, I acknowledge with gratitude, I have reaped much pleaſure and inſtruction.

§ 15. To conclude what relates to various readings; thoſe variations, which do not affect either the ſenſe or the connection, I take no notice of; becauſe the much greater part of them would occaſion no difference in tranſlating, and even of the few of theſe which might admit ſome difference, the difference is more in words than in meaning. Again, ſuch variations as even alter the ſenſe, but are not tolerably ſupported, by either external or internal evidence, eſpecially when the common reading has nothing in it apparently irrational, or unſuitable to the context, I have not judged neceſſary to mention. Thoſe, on the contrary, which not only in ſome degree affect the ſenſe, but, from their own intrinſic evidence, or from the reſpectable ſupport of manuſcripts and verſions, have divided the critics about their authenticity, I have taken care to ſpecify. When the evidence in their favour appeared to me clearly to preponderate, I have admitted them into the text, and aſſigned my reaſon in the notes. Wherever the matter ſeemed dubious, I have preferred the common reading, and ſuggeſted, in the notes, what may be advanced in favour of the other. When the difference lay in the rejection of a clauſe commonly received, though the probability were againſt its admiſſion, yet, if the ſentence or clauſe were remark-

able,

able, and if it neither conveyed a ſentiment unſuitable to the general ſcope, nor brought obſcurity on the context, I have judged it better to retain it, than to ſhock many readers by the diſmiſſion of what they have been accuſtomed to read in their Bible. At the ſame time, to diſtinguiſh ſuch clauſes, as of doubtful authority, I incloſe them in crotchets, Of this the doxology, as it is called in the Lord's prayer, is an example. In other caſes, I have not ſcrupled to omit what did not appear ſufficiently ſupported.

PART. III.

The Dialect employed.

AS to what concerns the language of this verſion, I have not much to add to the explanations I have given of my ſentiments on this article, in the latter part of the preceding Diſſertation, and the firſt part of the preſent. When the common tranſlation was made, and (which is ſtill earlier) when the Engliſh liturgy was compoſed, the reigning dialect was not entirely the ſame with that which prevails at preſent. Now, as the dialect, which then obtained, does very rarely, even to the readers of this age, either injure the ſenſe, or affect the perſpicuity, I have judged it proper, in a great meaſure, to retain it. The differences are neither great nor numerous. The third perſon ſingular of the preſent of the verb, terminates in the ſyllable *eth*, in the old dialect, not in the letter *s*, as in that now current. The participles are very rarely contracted; nor is there ever any eliſion of the vowels. Indeed, theſe eliſions though not entirely laid aſide, are become much leſs frequent now than they were about the beginning of the century. The difference is, in itſelf, inconſiderable: yet, as all ranks and denominations of Chriſtians are, from the uſe of either the Bible, or the Book of Common Prayer, or both, habituated to this dialect, and as it has contracted a dignity favourable to ſerioufneſs, from its appropriation to ſacred purpoſes, it is, I think, in a verſion of any part of holy writ, entitled to be preferred to the modern dialect.

§ 2. THE gayer part of mankind will doubtleſs think, that there is more vivacity in our common ſpeech, as, by retrenching a few unneceſſary vowels, the expreſſion is ſhortened, and the ſentiment conveyed with greater quickneſs. But vivacity is not the character of the language of the ſacred penmen. Gravity here, or even ſolemnity, if not carried to exceſs, is much more ſuitable. "I bid this man," ſays the centurion, in the anonymous tranſlation (*e*), "Go, and he's gone; another, Come, and he's here; "and to my ſervant, Do this, and it is done." And in the parallel place in Luke (*e*), "Lord, don't give "yourſelf the trouble of coming; I don't deſerve "you ſhould honour my houſe with your preſence." There are, I believe, not a few who would prefer this manner to that of the common verſion, as being much ſmarter, as well as more genteel. Surely, if that interpreter had given the ſmalleſt attention to uniformity, he would never have rendered αμην αμην λεγω υμιν, as he ſometimes does, by the antiquated phraſe, *Verily, verily I ſay unto you*. It would have been but of a piece with many paſſages of his verſion, to employ the more modiſh, and more gentlemanlike aſſeveration, "Upon my honour." With thoſe who can reliſh things ſacred in this dreſs (diſguiſe rather), I ſhould think it in vain to diſpute.

§ 3. ANOTHER criterion of that ſolemn dialect, is the recourſe, when an individual is addreſſed, to the ſingular number of the ſecond perſonal pronoun *thou* and *thee*, and, conſequently, to the ſecond perſon ſingular of the verb, which being, in common language, ſupplied by the plural, is in a manner obſolete. This alſo is, from ſcriptural uſe, and the conſtant uſe of it in worſhip, in the Britiſh dominions, both by thoſe of the eſtabliſhment, and by diſſenters, univerſally intelligible, and now conſidered as the proper dialect of religion. Immediately after the Reformation, the like mode, in uſing the pronoun, was adopted by all Proteſtant tranſlators into French, Italian, and German, as well as into Engliſh. But as, in Roman Catholic countries, thoſe tranſlations were of no authority; and as the Scriptures are read in their churches, and their devotions and ceremonies

(*e*) Matth. viii. 9. (*f*) Luke, vii. 6.

remonies performed in a language not underſtood by the people; the cuſtoms of diſſenters, as all Proteſtants are in thoſe countries, could not introduce, into the language of religion, ſo great a ſingularity of idiom. And as there was nothing to recommend this manner to the people, but ſeveral things to prejudice them againſt it, we do not find that it has been employed by any late Popiſh tranſlators into French.

What tended to prejudice them againſt it, is, firſt, the general diſuſe of it in the ordinary intercourſe of men; and, ſecondly, the conſideration that the few exceptions from this diſuſe, in common life, inſtead of ſhowing reſpect or reverence, ſuggeſts always either pity or contempt; no perſon being ever addreſſed in this way but one greatly inferior, or a child. This being the caſe, and they not having, like us, a ſolemn, to counterbalance the familiar, uſe, the practice of Proteſtants would rather encreaſe, than diminiſh, their diſlike of it. For theſe reaſons, the uſe of the ſingular pronoun, in adoration, has the ſame effect, nearly, on them, which the contrary uſe of the plural has on us. To a French Catholic, *Tu es nôtre Dieu, et nous te benirons*, and to an Engliſh Proteſtant, *You are our God, and we will bleſs you*, equally betray an indecent familiarity (*g*). In conſequence of this difference in the prevailing uſages, it muſt be acknowledged, that French Romaniſts have a plauſible pretext for uſing the plural. We have, however, a real advantage in our manner, eſpecially in worſhip. Theirs, it is true, in conſequence of the prevalent uſe, has nothing in it diſreſpectful or indecent; but this is merely a negative commendation: ours, on account of the peculiarity of its appropriation in religious ſubjects, is eminently ſerious and affecting. It has, beſides, more preciſion. In worſhip, it is a more explicit declaration of the unity of the Godhead; and even when, in holy writ, addreſſed to a creature, it ſerves to remove at leaſt one ambiguous circumſtance, conſequent on modern uſe, which does not rightly diſtinguiſh what is ſaid to one, from what is ſaid to many. And though the ſcope of the place often ſhow the diſtinction, it does not always.

§ 4. A FEW other particulars of the ancient dialect I have alſo retained, eſpecially in thoſe inſtances wherein, without hurting perſpicuity, they appeared to give greater preciſion: but thoſe, on the contrary, which might, in ſome inſtances, darken the expreſſion, or render it equivocal, I have rejected altogether. For I conſider no quality of elocution as more eſſential than perſpicuity, and nothing more conducive to this, than as much uniformity and preciſion, as the language will admit, in the application of words. For this reaſon, though I have retained *whether* for which of two, *whoſo* for whoever, and a few others, little uſed at preſent; I have not employed *which*, as in the old dialect, for who, or whom, *his* or *her* for its, *that* for that which, or what. For theſe, though they do not often occaſion ambiguity, ſometimes occaſion it; and there is no way of preventing doubt in every caſe, but by obſerving uniformity, when practicable, in all caſes. In ſuch an expreſſion, for example, as that of the Apoſtle Peter (*h*), "Being "born again by the word of God, which liveth and "abideth for ever;" if the relative *which* were applied, indiſcriminately, to perſons or to things, it might be queſtioned, whether what is affirmed, be affirmed of the word of God, or of God himſelf. But if, according to preſent uſe, it be confined to things, there is no queſtion at all.

§ 5. ANOTHER point, in which the ſcriptural differs from the modern dialect, is in the manner ſometimes uſed in expreſſing the future. In all predictions, prophecies, or authoritative declarations, the auxiliary *ſhall* is uſed, where, in common language, it would now be *will*. This method, as adding weight to what is ſaid, I always adopt, unleſs when it is liable to be equivocally interpreted, and ſeems to repreſent moral agents as acting through neceſſity, or by compulſion. In the graver ſorts of poetry, the ſame uſe is made of the auxiliary *ſhall*. As to the prepoſitions, I obſerved, in the preceding Diſſertation (*i*), that the preſent uſe gives them more preciſion, and ſo occaſions fewer ambiguities, than the uſe which prevailed formerly. I have, therefore, given it the preference. There is one caſe, however, wherein I always

(*g*) The way in which *Saci*, who appears to have been a pious worthy man, tranſlates from the Vulgate the Lord's Prayer, rendered literally from French into Engliſh, is a ſtriking example of the difference of manner: "Our Father who are in "heaven, let your name be ſanctified, let your reign arrive, let your will be done," &c. Yet the earlier Popiſh tranſlators choſe to uſe the ſingular number as well as the reformed. It had been the univerſal practice of the ancients, Greeks, Romans, and Orientals. It was uſed in the Engliſh tranſlation of Rheims, though compoſed by Papiſts in oppoſition to the Proteſtant verſion then commonly received. In the later verſions of French Proteſtants, this uſe of the ſingular number of the ſecond perſon is given up entirely, except in addreſſes to God; the formularies read in their meetings, having, in this particular, eſtabliſhed among them a different uſage. Beauſobre and Lenfant [ſee *Preface Generale ſur le Nouveau Teſtament*] ſtrenuouſly maintain the propriety of their not uſing the ſingular of the ſecond perſonal pronoun, except in worſhip. I admit their arguments to be concluſive with reſpect to French; but, for the reaſons above mentioned, they are inconcluſive applied to Engliſh. Yet in this ſome Engliſh tranſlators have followed the French manner, but not uniformly.

(*h*) 1 Pet. i. 23.

(*i*) Part II.

I always obſerve the old method. *Called of God, choſen of God*, and the other like phraſes, are for an obvious reaſon, more agreeable to Chriſtian ears, than if we were to prefix to the name of God the prepoſition *by*. The pronouns *mine* and *thine*, I have alſo, ſometimes, after the ancient manner, in order to avoid a diſagreeable hiatus, ſubſtituted for *my* and *thy*.

§ 6. To the foregoing remarks on the ſubject of dialect, I ſhall ſubjoin a few things on the manner of rendering proper names. Upon the revival of letters in the Weſt, Pagnin firſt, and after him ſome other tranſlators, through an affectation of accuracy in things of no moment, ſo juſtly cenſured by Jerom, ſeem to have conſidered it as a vaſt improvement, to convey, as nearly as poſſible, in the letters of another language, the very ſounds of the Hebrew and Syriac names which occur in Scripture. Hence the names of ſome of the moſt eminent perſonages in the Old Teſtament, were, by this new dialect, ſo much metamorphoſed, that thoſe who were accuſtomed to the ancient tranſlation, could not, at firſt hearing, recognize the perſons with whoſe hiſtory they had been long acquainted. The *Heva* of the Vulgate was transformed into *Chauva*, the *Iſaia* into *Jeſahiahu*, the *Jeremia* into *Irmeiahu*, and the *Ezechiel* into *Jechezeehel*, and ſimilar changes were made on many others. In this Pagnin ſoon had, if not followers, at leaſt imitators. The trifling innovations made by him, after his manner, have ſerved as an example to others to innovate alſo after theirs. Junius and Tremellius, though they ſay, with Pagnin, *Chauva*, do not adopt his *Jeſahiahu*, *Irmeiahu*, and *Jechezechel*; but they give us what is no better of their own, *Jiſchahja*, *Jirmeja*, and *Jechezkel*. Munſter's deviations are leſs conſiderable, and Caſtalio went no further (except in transforming the name of God into *Jave*), than to give a Latin termination to the names formerly uſed, that he might thereby render them declinable.

§ 7. A DEVIATION purely of this laſt kind, as it ſerved to prevent ambiguities, otherwiſe inevitable, in the Latin, where there was no ambiguity in the original, did, in my opinion, admit a good apology. For, what was expreſſed in Hebrew, by the aid of the *ſtatus conſtructus*, as their grammarians call it, or by prepoſitions, was expreſſed, with equal clearneſs, in Latin, by means of declenſion: whereas, by making the names indeclinable, in this language, that advantage had been loſt, in regard to many names; and ambiguities, of which there was not a trace in the original, introduced into the tranſlation. The declenſion of proper names was not, however, equally eſſential to perſpicuity in Greek as in Latin. Their want of caſes, the Greeks could ſupply by the caſes of the article, which the idiom of their tongue permitted them to prefix. But the Latins had no article. It was, therefore, very injudicious in the firſt Latin tranſlators to imitate the Seventy in this particular; the more ſo, as it had been the common practice of Latin authors, to decline the foreign names they adopted, in order the more effectually to fit them for uſe in their tongue. Thus they ſaid, *Hannibal Hanibalis*, *Juba Jubæ*, and *Hanno Hannonis*. The inconveniencies of the other manner appear from many equivocal paſſages in the Vulgate, which, without ſome previous knowledge of the ſubject, it would be difficult to underſtand (*i*). Caſtalio, in like manner, introduced into his verſion patronymics formed on the Grecian model, as *Jacobida* and *Davidides*, in which, as he has not been followed, we may conclude that he is generally condemned; and, in my opinion, not undeſervedly, becauſe the departure from the Hebrew idiom, in this inſtance, is both unneceſſary and affected.

§ 8. BUT, though it be excuſable to alter the names in common uſe, ſo far as to make them admit inflections in languages which uſe inflections, ſince this alteration anſwers a neceſſary purpoſe; to alter them, for the ſake of bringing them nearer the ancient orthography, or for the ſake of aſſiſting us to produce a ſound in pronouncing them, that may reſemble the ſound of the ancient names, is no better than arrant pedantry. The uſe of proper names is, as that of appellatives, to ſerve as ſigns, for recalling to the mind what is ſignified by them. When this purpoſe is attained, their end is anſwered. Now, as it is uſe alone which can convert a ſound into a ſign, a word that has been long uſed (whether a proper name or an appellative) as the ſign of perſon or thing, genus, ſpecies, or individual, muſt be preferable to a new invented, and therefore unauthoriſed ſound. If there is generally in proper names a greater reſemblance to the original words than in appellatives, this difference nowiſe affects the argument.

Appellatives

(*i*) Several inſtances occur in the prophetical benediction which Moſes gave to the twelve tribes, immediately before his death, Deut. xxxiii. In verſe 4. *Legem præcepit nobis Moyſes, hæreditatem multitudinis Jacob.* To one unacquainted with Scripture, it would not be obvious that *Moyſes* here is in the nominative, and *Jacob* in the genitive. Hardly could it be ſuſpected, that in the following verſes, 8. *Levi quoque ait*; 12. *Et Benjamin ait* (and ſo of the reſt), the names are in the dative. The form of the expreſſion in Latin could not fail to lead an ordinary reader to underſtand them as in the nominative. Yet nothing can be more unequivocal than the words in Hebrew.

Appellatives are the ſigns of ſpecies and genera, with the more conſiderable part of which the people are acquainted in all civilized countries. Common things have conſequently names in all languages; and the names in one language have often no affinity to thoſe in another. Proper names are the ſigns of individuals, known originally only in the neighbourhood of the place of their exiſtence, whence the name is transferred with the knowledge of the individual into other languages.

But the introduction of the name is not becauſe of any peculiar propriety in the ſound for ſignifying what is meant by it; but merely becauſe, when the language we write does not ſupply a ſuitable term, this is the eaſieſt and moſt natural expedient. It is in this way alſo we often provide appellatives, when the thing ſpoken of, which ſometimes happens, has no name in our native idiom. But when an individual thing is of a nature to be univerſally known, and to have a name in every language, as the ſun, the moon, and the earth, we never, in tranſlating from an ancient tongue, think of adopting the name we find there, but always give our own. Yet the things now mentioned are as really individuals, as are Peter, James, and John. And when, in the caſe of appellatives, we have been obliged at firſt to recur for a name, to the language whence we drew our knowledge of the thing, we never think afterwards of reforming the term, becauſe not ſo cloſely formed on the original, as it might have been. It has, by its currency, produced that aſſociation which confers on it the power of a ſign, and this is all that the original term itſelf ever had, or could have. Who would think of reforming flail into *flagel*, meſſenger into *meſſager*, and nurſe into *nourrice*, that they may be nearer, the firſt to the Latin, or perhaps the German, and the ſecond and third to the French originals?

§ 9. BESIDES, in tranſlating Hebrew names, the attempt was the more vain, as little or nothing was known about their pronunciation. The manner of pronouncing the conſonants is judged of very differently by the critics; and as to the vowels, who has not heard what conteſts they have occaſioned among the learned? But what rendered this attempt, at giving the exact pronunciation, completely ridiculous, is, that it was made in Latin, a dead language, of whoſe pronunciation alſo we have no ſtandard, and in the ſpeaking or reading of which, every different nation follows a different rule. Harmony among themſelves, therefore, was not to be expected in men who had taken this whim. Accordingly, when they once began to innovate, every one innovated after his own faſhion, and had a liſt of names peculiar to himſelf. This, with reaſonable people, has ſufficiently expoſed the folly of the conceit.

§ 10. Now, though our tranſlators have not made the violent ſtretches made by Pagnin and others, for the ſake of adjuſting the names to the original ſounds, and have not diſtreſſed our organs of ſpeech with a colliſion of letters hardly utterable; there is one article on which I do not think them entirely without blame. The names of the ſame perſons, and in effect the ſame names, are ſometimes rendered differently by them in the New Teſtament, from what they had been rendered in the Old; and that, on account of a very inconſiderable difference in the ſpelling, or perhaps only in the termination in Hebrew and in Greek. By this the ſenſe has been injured to ordinary readers, who are more generally ignorant than we are apt to imagine, of the perſons in the Old Teſtament, meant by the names in the New. Now this is a ſpecies of κακοζηλια, from which the authors of the Vulgate were free.

The old Italic had been made from the Greek of the Seventy. The names by conſequence were more accommodated to the Greek orthography than to the Hebrew. But as that was a matter of no conſequence, when Jerom undertook to tranſlate from the Hebrew, he did not think it expedient to make any changes in the proper names to which the people had been habituated from their infancy. He knew that this might have led ſome readers into miſtakes, and, as appearing aukward and affected, would be diſagreeable to others: at the ſame time there was no conceivable advantage from it to compenſate theſe inconveniencies. For, to tell the Latin reader more exactly how the Hebrew proper names ſounded (if that could have been done), was of no more ſignificance to him, than to acquaint him with the ſound of their appellatives. He therefore judged rightly, in preſerving in the Old Teſtament, though he tranſlated from the Hebrew, the names to which the people were accuſtomed, as Elias, and Eliſeus, and Eſdras, and Nebuchodonoſor, which were formed immediately from the Greek. By this means there was an uniformity in the manner of tranſlating both Teſtaments. The prophets and other eminent ancients, were not diſtinguiſhed by one name in one part of the ſacred text, and by another in the other. Whereas the attempt at tracing ſervilely the letter in each part, has given us two ſets of names for the ſame perſons, of which the inconveniencies are glaring, but the advantages inviſible.

§ 11. IT may be thought indeed a matter of little conſequence, and that the names, if not the ſame, do at leaſt ſo cloſely reſemble, that they can hardly be

be miſtaken for the names of different perſons. But I have had occaſion to diſcover that many of the unlearned, though neither ignorant nor deficient in underſtanding, know not that *Elias*, ſo oftenmentioned in the New Teſtament, is the Elijah of the Old, that *Eliſeus* is Eliſha, that *Oſee* is Hoſea, and that the *Jeſus*, mentioned once in the Acts (*k*), and once in the epiſtle to the Hebrews (*l*), is Joſhua. Had the names been totally different in the original, there might have been ſome reaſon for adopting this method. The old Oriental names are often of uſe for pointing out the founders of nations, families, and tribes, and the more recent Greek names ſerve to connect thoſe early notices with the later accounts of Greek and Roman hiſtorians. If they had, therefore, in the tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, given as in the original, the name *Mizraim* to Egypt, *Aram* to Syria, and *Juvan* to Greece, much might have been urged in defence of this manner. But when all the difference in the words reſults from an inſignificant alteration in the ſpelling, in order to accommodate the Hebrew name to Grecian ears; to conſider them on that account as different names, and tranſlate them differently, does not appear ſuſceptible of a rational apology.

What ſhould we think of a tranſlator of Polybius, for example, who ſhould always call Carthage *Karchedon*, and Hannibal *Annibas*, becauſe the words of his author are Καρχηδων and Αννιβας, or, to come nearer home, ſhould, in tranſlating into Engliſh from the French, call London *Londres*, and the Hague *La Haye*. It can be aſcribed ſolely to the almoſt irreſiſtible influence of example, that our tranſlators, who were eminent for their diſcernment as well as their learning, have been drawn into this frivolous innovation. At the ſame time their want of uniformity, in uſing this method, ſeems to betray a conſciouſneſs of ſome impropriety in it, and that it tended unneceſſarily to darken what in itſelf is perfectly clear. Accordingly, they have not thought it adviſable to exhibit the names in moſt frequent uſe, differently in different parts of Scripture, or even differently from the names by which the perſons are known in profane hiſtory. Thus he whom they have called Moſes in the New Teſtament, is not in the Old Teſtament made *Moſheh*, nor Solomon *Shelomeh*; nor is Artaxerxes rendered *Artachſhaſta*, nor Cyrus *Choreſh*, agreeably to the Hebrew orthography, though the names of the two laſt mentioned, are not derived to us from the New Teſtament, but from Pagan hiſtorians.

§. 12. Not that I think it of any moment whether the names be derived from the Greek, or from the Hebrew, or from any other language. The matters of conſequence here are only theſe two. Firſt, to take the name in moſt current uſe, whether it be formed from the Hebrew, from the Greek, or from the Latin; ſecondly, to uſe the ſame name in both Teſtaments, when the difference made on it in the two languages, is merely ſuch a change in the ſpelling and termination, as commonly takes place in tranſplanting a word from one tongue into another. Nothing can be more vain than the attempt to bring us, in pronouncing names, to a ſtronger reſemblance to the original ſounds. Were this, as it is not, an object deſerving the attention of an interpreter, it were eaſy to ſhow that the methods employed for this purpoſe, have often had the contrary effect. We have in this moſtly followed German and Dutch linguiſts.

Admitting that they came near the truth, according to their rule of pronouncing, which is the utmoſt they can aſk, the powers of the ſame nominal letters are different in the different languages ſpoken at preſent in Europe; and we, by following their ſpelling, even when they were in the right, have departed farther from the original ſound than we were before. The conſonant *j*, ſounds in German like our *y* in the word *year*, *ſch* with them ſounds like our *ſh*, like the French *ch*, and like the Italian *ſc*, when it immediately precedes *i* or *e*; whereas *ſch* with us has generally the ſame ſound with *ſk*, and the conſonant *j* the ſame with *g* before *i* or *e*. Beſides, the letters which with us have different ſounds in different ſituations, we have reaſon to believe, were ſounded uniformly in ancient languages, or, at leaſt, did not undergo alterations correſpondent to ours. Thus the brook called *Kidron*, in the common verſion in the Old Teſtament, is, for the ſake, I ſuppoſe, of a cloſer conformity to the Greek, called *Cedron* in the New. Yet the *c* in our language in this ſituation, is ſounded exactly as the *ſ*, a ſound which we have good ground to think that the correſponding letter in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, never had.

§ 13. The rules, therefore, which I have followed in expreſſing proper names, are theſe: Firſt, when the name of the ſame perſon or thing is, in the common tranſlation, both in the Old Teſtament and in the New, expreſſed in the ſame manner, whether it be derived from the Hebrew or from the Greek, I uniformly employ it, becauſe in that caſe it has always the ſanction of good uſe. Thus *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *David* and *Solomon*, *Jeruſalem* and *Jericho*, *Bethlehem* and *Jordan*, and many others, remain in the places of which they have had immemorial

(*k*) Acts, vii. 45.

(*l*) Heb. iv. 8.

rial poſſeſſion, though of theſe *Moſes* and *Solomon* are directly from the Greek, the reſt from the Hebrew. Secondly, when the name of the ſame perſon or thing is expreſſed, in the common tranſlation, differently in the Old Teſtament and in the New (the difference being ſuch as reſults from adapting words of one language to the articulation of another), I have, except in a very few caſes, preferred the word uſed in the Old Teſtament. This does not proceed from the deſire of coming nearer the pronunciation of the Hebrew root: for that is a matter of no conſequence; but from the deſire of preventing, as far as poſſible, all miſtakes in regard to the perſons or things ſpoken of. It is from the Old Teſtament, that we have commonly what is known of the individuals mentioned in it, and referred to in the New. By naming them differently, there is a danger leſt the perſon or thing alluded to be miſtaken.

For this reaſon, I ſay, *Elijah*, not Elias; *Eliſha*, not Eliſeus; *Iſaiah*, not Eſaias; *Kidron*, not Cedron. For this reaſon, alſo, in the catalogues of our Lord's progenitors, both in Matthew and in Luke, I have given the names as they are ſpelt in the common verſion of the Old Teſtament. From this rule I admit ſome exceptions. In a few inſtances, the thing mentioned is better known, either by what is ſaid of it in the New Teſtament, or by the information we derive from Pagan authors, than by what we find in the Old. In this caſe, the name, in the New Teſtament, has a greater currency than that uſed in the Old, and, conſequently, according to my notion of what ought to regulate our choice, is entitled to the preference. For this reaſon, I ſay *Sarepta* and *Sidon*, not Zarephath and Zidon; as the former names are rendered, by claſſical uſe, as well as that of the New Teſtament, more familiar than the latter. Thirdly, when the ſame name is given, by the ſacred writers, in their own language, to different perſons which the Engliſh tranſlators have rendered differently in the different applications, I have judged it reaſonable to adopt this diſtinction, made by our old interpreters, as conducing to perſpicuity. The name of Jacob's fourth ſon is the ſame with that of two of the Apoſtles. But as the firſt rule obliges me to give the Old Teſtament name *Judah* to the Patriarch, I have reſerved the term *Judas*, as uſed in the New, for the two Apoſtles. This alſo ſuits univerſal and preſent uſe: for we never call the Patriarch Judas, or any of the Apoſtles Judah. The proper name of our Lord is the ſame with that of *Joſhua*, who is, in the Septuagint, always called Ιησους, and is twice ſo named in the New Teſtament. Every body muſt be ſenſible of the expediency of confining the Old Teſtament name to the captain of the hoſt of Iſrael, and the other to the Meſſiah. There can be no doubt, that the name of Aaron's ſiſter, and that of our Lord's mother, were originally the ſame. The former is called in the Septuagint, Μαριαμ, the name alſo given to the latter by the Evangeliſt Luke. The other Evangeliſts commonly ſay, Μαρια. But as uſe, with us, has appropriated *Miriam* to the firſt, and *Mary* to the ſecond, it could anſwer no valuable purpoſe to confound them. The name of the father of the twelve tribes is, in the Oriental dialects, the ſame with that of one of the ſons of Zebedee, and that of the ſon of Alpheus. A ſmall diſtinction is, indeed, made by the Evangeliſts, who add a Greek termination to the Hebrew name, when they apply it to the Apoſtles, which, when they apply it to the Patriarch, they never do. If our tranſlators had copied as minutely, in this inſtance, as they have done in ſome others, the Patriarch they would indeed have named *Jacob*, and each of the two Apoſtles *Jacobus*. However, as in naming the two laſt, they have thought fit to ſubſtitute *James*, which uſe alſo has confirmed, I have preſerved this diſtinction.

§ 14. Upon the whole, in all that concerns proper names, I have conformed to the judicious rule of King James the firſt, more ſtrictly, I ſuppoſe, than thoſe tranſlators to whom it was recommended: "The names of the Prophets, and the holy writers, "with the other names in the text, are to be retained, "as near as may be, according as they are vulgarly "uſed."

PART

PART IV.

The outward Form of the Verſion.

I AM now to offer a few things on the form in which this tranſlation is exhibited. It is well known, that the diviſion of the books of holy writ, into chapters and verſes, does not proceed from the inſpired writers, but is a contrivance of a much later date. Even the punctuation, for diſtinguiſhing the ſentences from one another, and dividing every ſentence into its conſtituent members and clauſes, though a more ancient invention, was, for many ages, except by grammarians and rhetoricians, hardly ever uſed in tranſcribing; inſomuch, that whatever depends merely on the diviſion of ſentences, on points, aſpirations, and accents, cannot be ſaid to reſt ultimately, as the words themſelves do, upon the authority of the ſacred penmen. Theſe particulars give free ſcope for the ſagacity of criticiſm, and unreſtrained exerciſe to the talent of inveſtigating; inaſmuch, as in none of theſe points is there any ground for the plea of inſpiration.

§ 2. As to the diviſion into chapters and verſes, we know that the preſent is not that which obtained in primitive ages, and that even the earlieſt diviſion is not derived from the Apoſtles, but from ſome of their firſt commentators, who, for the conveniency of readers, contrived this method. The diviſion into chapters, that now univerſally prevails in Europe, derived its origin from Cardinal Caro, who lived in the twelfth century: the ſubdiviſion into verſes is of no older date than the middle of the ſixteenth century, and was the invention of Robert Stevens. That there are many advantages which reſult from ſo minute a partition of the ſacred oracles, cannot be denied. The facility with which any place, in conſequence of this method, is pointed out by the writer, and found by the reader, the eaſy recourſe it gives, in conſulting commentators, to the paſſage whereof the explanation is wanted, the aid it has afforded to the compilers of concordances, which are of conſiderable aſſiſtance in the ſtudy of Scripture; theſe and many other accommodations, have accrued from this contrivance.

§ 3. IT is not, however, without its inconveniences. This manner of mincing a connected work into ſhort ſentences detached from one another, not barely in appearance, by their being ranked under ſeparate numbers, and by the breaks in the lines, but in effect, by the influence which the text, thus parcelled out, has inſenſibly had on copiers and tranſlators both in pointing and tranſlating, is not well ſuited to the ſpecies of compoſition which obtains in all the ſacred books, except the Pſalms and the book of Proverbs. To the epiſtolary and argumentative ſtyle it is extremely ill adapted, as has been well evinced by Mr. Locke (*m*); neither does it ſuit the hiſtorical. There are inconveniencies which would reſult from this way of dividing, even if executed in the beſt manner poſſible: but though I am unwilling to detract from the merit of an expedient, which has been productive of ſome good conſequences, I cannot help obſerving that the inventors have been far too haſty in conducting the execution.

The ſubject is ſometimes interrupted by the diviſion into chapters. Of this I might produce many examples, but, for brevity's ſake, ſhall mention only a few. The laſt verſe of the fifteenth chapter of Matthew is much more cloſely connected with what follows in the ſixteenth, than with what precedes. In like manner, the laſt verſe of the nineteenth chapter, "Many ſhall be firſt that are laſt, and laſt that are "firſt," ought not to be disjoined, (I ſay not, from the ſubſequent chapter, but even) from the ſubſequent paragraph, which contains the parable of the labourers hired to work in the vineyard, brought merely in illuſtration of that ſentiment, and beginning and ending with it. The firſt verſe of the fifth chapter of Mark is much more properly joined to the concluding paragraph of the fourth chapter, as it ſhews the completeneſs of the miracle there related, than to what follows in the fifth. The like may be remarked of the firſtverſe of the ninth chapter. Of the diviſion into verſes, it may be obſerved, that it often occaſions an unnatural ſeparation of the members of the ſame ſentence (*n*); nay, ſometimes, which is worſe, the ſame verſe comprehends a part of two different ſentences.

That this diviſion ſhould often have a bad effect upon tranſlators is inevitable. Firſt, by attending narrowly to the verſes, an interpreter runs the riſk

(*m*) *Eſſay for the underſtanding of St. Paul's Epiſtles*, prefixed to his paraphraſe and notes on ſome of the Epiſtles.
(*n*) In Matth. xi. 2. we have a verſe without a verb, and ending with a comma.

of overlooking the right, and adopting a wrong, diviſion of the ſentences. Of this I ſhall give one remarkable example from the Goſpel of John (o). Our Lord ſays, in one of his diſcourſes, εγω ειμι ο ποιμην ο καλος· και γινωσκω τα εμα, και γινωσκομαι υπο των εμων, καθως γινωσκει με ο πατηρ, καγω γινωσκω τον πατερα· και την ψυχην μου τιθημι υπερ των προβατων. When the ſentence is thus pointed, as it manifeſtly ought to be, and exhibited unbroken by the diviſion into verſes, no perſon can doubt that the following verſion is equally cloſe to the letter and to the ſenſe. "I am "the good ſhepherd; I both know my own, and "am known by them, even as the Father knoweth "me, and I know the Father; and I lay down my "life for the ſheep. But the being divided into two ſentences, and put into ſeparate verſes, has occaſioned the disjointed and improper verſion given in the common tranſlation. "14. I am the good Shep- "herd and know my ſheep; and am known of mine. "15. As the Father knoweth me, even ſo know I "the Father: and I lay down my life for the ſheep." In this artificial diſtribution (which ſeems to have originated from Beza; for he acknowledges that before him, the fifteenth verſe included only the laſt member, *and I lay down*, &c.) the ſecond ſentence is an abrupt, and totally unconnected interruption of what is affirmed in the preceding words, and in the following. Whereas, taking the words as they ſtand naturally, it is an illuſtration by ſimilitude quite in our Lord's manner, of what he had affirmed in the foregoing words. But though the tranſlator ſhould not be miſled in this manner, a deſire of preſerving, in every verſe of his tranſlation, all that is found in the correſponding verſe of his original, that he may adjuſt the one to the other, and give verſe for verſe, may oblige him to give the words a more unnatural arrangement, in his own language, than he would have thought of doing, if there had been no ſuch diviſion into verſes, and he had been left to regulate himſelf ſolely by the ſenſe.

§ 4. INFLUENCED by theſe conſiderations, I have determined neither entirely to reject the common diviſion, nor to adopt it in the manner which is uſually done. To reject it entirely, would be to give up one of the greateſt conveniences we have in the uſe of any verſion, for every purpoſe of occaſional conſultation and examination, as well as for comparing it with the original and with other verſions. Nor is it enough that a more commodious diviſion than the preſent may be deviſed, which ſhall anſwer all the uſeful purpoſes of the common verſion without its inconveniencies. Still there are ſome advantages which a new diviſion could not have, at leaſt for many centuries. The common diviſion, ſuch as it is, has prevailed univerſally, and does prevail, not in this kingdom only, but throughout all Chriſtendom. Concordances in different languages, commentaries, verſions, paraphraſes; all theological works, critical, polemical, devotional, practical, in their order of commenting on Scripture, and in all their references to Scripture, regulate themſelves by it. If we would not then have a new verſion rendered in a great meaſure uſeleſs, to thoſe who read the old, or even the original, in the form wherein it is now invariably printed, or who have recourſe to any of the helps above mentioned, we are conſtrained to adopt in ſome ſhape or other, the old diviſion.

§ 5. FOR theſe reaſons I have judged it neceſſary to retain it; but at the ſame time, in order to avoid the diſadvantages attending it, I have followed the method taken by ſome other editors, and confined it to the margin. This anſwers ſufficiently all the purpoſes of reference and compariſon, without tending ſo directly to interrupt the reader, and divert him from perceiving the natural connection of the things treated. I have alſo adopted ſuch a new diviſion into ſections and paragraphs, as appeared to me better ſuited than the former both to the ſubject of theſe hiſtories, and to the manner of treating it. Nothing ſurely can be more incongruous, than to cut down a coherent narrative into ſhreds, and give it the appearance of a collection of aphoriſms. This, therefore, I have carefully avoided. The ſections are, one with another, nearly equal to two chapters; a few of them more, but many leſs. In making this diviſion, I have been determined, partly by the ſenſe, and partly by the ſize. In every ſection I have included ſuch a portion of Scripture as ſeemed proper to be read at one time by thoſe who regularly devote a part of every day to this truly Chriſtian exerciſe. To make all the portions of equal length, or nearly ſo, was utterly incompatible with a proper regard to the ſenſe. I have avoided breaking off in the middle of a diſtinct ſtory, parable, converſation, or even diſcourſe, delivered in continuance.

The length of three of the longeſt ſections in this work was occaſioned by the reſolution not to disjoin the parts of one continued diſcourſe. The ſections I I allude to are *the ſermon on the mount*, and *the prophecy on Olivet*, as recorded by Matthew, together with our Lord's *valedictory conſolations* to his diſciples, as related by John. The firſt occupies three ordinary chapters, the ſecond two long ones, and the third

(o) John, x. 14, 15.

third four ſhort chapters. But, though I have avoided making a ſeparation, where the ſcope of the place requires unity, I could not, in a conſiſtency with any regard to ſize, allot a ſeparate ſection to every ſeparate incident, parable, converſation, or miracle. When theſe, therefore, are briefly related, inſomuch that two or more of them can be included in a ſection of moderate length, I have ſeparated them only by paragraphs. The length of the paragraph is determined merely by the ſenſe. Accordingly ſome of them contain no more than a verſe of the common diviſion, and others little leſs than a chapter. One parable makes one paragraph. When an explanation is given ſeparately, the explanation makes another. When it follows immediately, and is expreſſed very briefly, both are included in one. Likewiſe one miracle makes one paragraph; but when the narrative is interrupted, and another miracle intervenes, as happens in the ſtory of the daughter of Jairus, more paragraphs are requiſite. When the tranſition, in reſpect of the ſenſe, ſeems to require a diſtinction more ſtrongly marked, it has been judged expedient to leave a blank line and begin the next paragraph with a word in capitals.

§ 6. It was not thought neceſſary to number the paragraphs, as this way is now, unleſs in particular caſes, and for ſpecial purpoſes, rather unuſual; and as all the uſe of reference and quotation may be ſufficiently anſwered by the old diviſion on the margin. In the larger diſtribution into ſections, I have, according to the moſt general cuſtom, both numbered and titled them. But as to this method of dividing, I will not pretend that it is not, in a good meaſure, arbitrary, and that it might not, with equal propriety, have been conducted otherwiſe. As it was neceſſary to comprehend diſtinct things in the ſame ſection, there was no clear rule by which one could, in all caſes, be directed where to make the ſeparation. It was indeed evident, that, wherever it could occaſion an unſeaſonable interruption in narration, dialogue, or argument, it was improper: and that this was all that could be aſcertained with preciſion. The titles of the ſection I have made as brief as poſſible, that they may be the more eaſily remembered; and have, for this purpoſe, employed words, as we find ſome employed in the rubric of the common prayer, which have not been admitted into the text. To theſe I have added, in the ſame taſte, the contents of the ſection, avoiding minuteneſs, and giving only ſuch hints of the principal matters, as may aſſiſt the reader to recall them to his remembrance, and may enable him at firſt glance to diſcover whether a paſſage he is looking for, be in the ſection or not. I have endeavoured to avoid the fault of thoſe who make the contents of the chapters ſupply, in ſome degree, a commentary, limiting the ſenſe of Scripture by their own ideas. Thoſe who have not dared to make ſo free with the text, have thought themſelves entitled to make free with theſe abridgments of their own framing. To inſert them without heſitation into the contents prefixed to the ſeveral chapters, and thereby inſinuate, under the ſhelter of inſpiration, doubtful meanings which favour their own prepoſſeſſions, I cannot help conſidering as one way of handling the word of God deceitfully. I have, therefore, avoided throwing any thing into thoſe ſummaries, which could be called explanatory, and have, beſides, thought it better to aſſign them a ſeparate place in this work, where the reader may conſult them, when he chuſes, than to intermix them with the truths we have directly from the ſacred writers.

§ 7. Most tranſlators have found it neceſſary to ſupply ſome words for the ſake of perſpicuity, and for accomodating the expreſſion to the idiom of the language into which the verſion is made, who, at the ſame time, to avoid even the appearance of aſſuming an undue authority to themſelves, have viſibly diſtinguiſhed the words ſupplied, from the reſt of the ſentence. Thus the Engliſh tranſlators, after Beza and others, always put the words in Italics by which an ellipſis in the original, that does not ſuit our idiom, is filled up. Though I approve their motives in uſing this method, as they are ſtrong indications of fairneſs and attention to accuracy; I cannot help thinking that, in the execution, they have ſometimes carried it to exceſs. In conſequence of the ſtructure of the original languages, ſeveral things are diſtinctly, though implicitly, expreſſed, which have no explicit ſigns in the ſentence. The perſonal pronouns, for example, both in power and in number, are as clearly, though virtually, expreſſed in their tongue, by the verb alone, as they are in ours by a ſeparate ſign. Thus *amo*, in Latin, is not leſs full and expreſſive than *I love* in Engliſh, or *amaviſtis* than *ye have loved*. And it would be exceedingly improper to ſay that in the former language there is an ellipſis of the pronoun, ſince the verb actually expreſſes it. For *amo* can be ſaid of none but the firſt perſon ſingular, and *amaviſtis* of none but the ſecond perſon plural. The like holds in other inſtances. The adjective ſometimes includes the power of the ſubſtantive. *Bonus* is a good man, *bona* a good woman, and *bonum* a good thing. Yet to mark an ellipſis ariſing from ſuch a want as that of a word correſponding to *man*, *woman*, and *thing*, in the above expreſſions, the Italic character has ſometimes been introduced by our tranſlators.

§ 8. I REMEMBER, that when I firſt obſerved this diſtinction of character in the Engliſh Bible, being then a ſchool-boy, I aſked my elder brother, who had been at college, the reaſon of the difference. He told me that the words in Italics were words to which there was nothing in the original that correſponded. This made me take greater notice of the difference afterwards, and often attempt to read, paſſing over thoſe words entirely. As this ſometimes ſucceeded, without any appearance of deficiency in the ſentence, I could not be ſatisfied of the propriety of ſome of the inſertions. Theſe words particularly attracted my attention (*p*). *Two* women *ſhall be grinding at the mill*, where the word *women* is in Italics. I could not conceive where the occaſion was for inſerting this word. Could it be more improper to ſay barely, *two ſhall be grinding at the mill*, than to ſay, as in the former verſe, *two ſhall be in the field*, without limiting it to either ſex? And ſince the Evangeliſt expreſſed both in the ſame manner, was any perſon entitled to make a difference? On having recourſe again for information, I was anſwered that the Evangeliſt had not expreſſed them both in the ſame manner; that, on the contrary, the firſt, as written by him, could be underſtood only of men, the ſecond only of women; as all the words ſuſceptible of gender were in the fortieth verſe in the maſculine, and in the forty-firſt in the feminine. I underſtood the anſwer, having before that time learnt as much Latin as ſufficiently ſhowed me the effect produced by the gender on the ſenſe. What then appeared to me unaccountable in the tranſlators was, firſt, their putting the word *women* in Italics, ſince, though it had not a particular word correſponding to it, it was clearly comprehended in the other words of the paſſage; and, ſecondly, their not adding *men* in the fortieth verſe, becauſe, by theſe two ſucceſſive verſes, the one in the maſculine, the other in the feminine gender, it appeared the manifeſt intention of the author to acquaint us, that both ſexes would be involved in the calamities of the times ſpoken of.

This is but one inſtance of many which might be given to ſhow how little dependence we can have on thoſe marks; and that if the unlearned were to judge of the perſpicuity of the original (as I once did) from the additions which it ſeems by the common verſion to have required, their judgment would be both unfavourable and erroneous. The original has, in many caſes, a perſpicuity as well as energy, which the ableſt interpreters find it difficult to convey into their verſions. The Evangeliſt John ſays of our Lord (*q*), εις τα ιδια ηλθε, και οι ιδιοι αυτον ου παρελαβον. I have expreſſed the ſentiment but not ſo forcibly, in this manner; *He came to his own land, and his own people did not receive him.* On the principles on which the Engliſh tranſlation is conducted, the words *land* and *people* ought to be viſibly diſtinguiſhed, as having no correſponding names in the original. That the old interpreters would have judged ſo, we may fairly conclude from their not admitting them, or any thing equivalent, into their verſion. Yet that their verſion is, on this account, leſs explicit than the original, cannot be doubted by thoſe that underſtand Greek, who muſt be ſenſible, that by the bare change of gender in the pronoun, the purport of thoſe names is conveyed with the greateſt clearneſs. See the note on that paſſage in the Goſpel.

§ 9. OUR tranſlators have not, however, obſerved uniformly their manner of diſtinguiſhing by the aid of Italics. Indeed, if they had, their work muſt have made a very motely appearance. On many occaſions, the Hebrew or Greek name requires more than one word in our language to expreſs a meaning which it often bears, and which alone ſuits the context. There was no reaſon, in rendering γλωσσα (*r*) to put *unknown* in Italics, before the word *tongue*, a ſtrange or unknown tongue being one very common ſignification of the word in the beſt authors. Πνευματα (*s*) is very properly rendered *ſpiritual gifts*: it means no leſs, in the Apoſtle Paul's language; but there was no propriety in diſtinguiſhing the word *gifts* by the Italic letter: for πνευματα, a ſubſtantive, can, in no inſtance, be rendered barely by the adjective *ſpiritual*. Sometimes the word in Italics is a mere intruder, to which there is not any thing in the import of the original, any more than in the expreſſion, either explicitly or implicitly correſponding, the ſenſe, which in effect it alters, being both clear and complete without it. For an example of this, I ſhall recur to a paſſage on which I had occaſion formerly to remark (*t*), "The juſt ſhall live by "faith; but if *any man* draw back"—where *any man* is foiſted into the text, in violation of the rules of interpreting, which compel us to admit the third perſonal pronoun *he* as clearly, though virtually, expreſſed by the verb. I do not remember ſuch another inſtance in the Engliſh tranſlation, though I had occaſion to obſerve ſomething ſtill more flagrant, in the verſion of the Old Teſtament by Junius and Tremellius (*u*).

§ 10. IT

(*p*) Matth. xxiv. 40, 41.
(*q*) John, i. 11.
(*r*) 1 Cor. xiv. 2.
(*s*) 1 Cor. xiv. 12.
(*t*) Diſſ. X. Part V. § 10.
(*u*) Diſſ. X. Part V. § 4.

§ 10. It muſt be acknowledged, however, that the inſertion of a word, or of a few words, is ſometimes neceſſary, or at leaſt convenient, for giving a ſufficiency of light to a ſentence. For let it be obſerved, that this is not attempting to give more perſpicuity to the ſacred writings in the tranſlation, than was given them by the inſpired penmen in the original. The contemporaries, particularly Helleniſt Jews, readers of the original, had many advantages, which, with all our aſſiſtances, we cannot attain. Incidental alluſions to rites, cuſtoms, facts, at that time recent and well known, now little known, and known only to a few, render ſome ſuch expedient extremely proper. There are many things which it would have been ſuperfluous in them to mention, which it may, nevertheleſs, be neceſſary for us to ſuggeſt. The uſe of this expedient has accordingly never been conſidered as beyond the legitimate province of the tranſlator. It is a liberty indeed which ought to be taken with diſcretion, and never but when the truth of what is ſupplied, and its appoſiteneſs, are both unqueſtionable. When I recur to this method, which is but ſeldom, I diſtinguiſh the words inſerted by encloſing them in crotchets, having reſerved the Italic character for a purpoſe now to be explained.

§ 11. In ſuch a work as the Goſpel, which, though of the nature of hiſtory, is a hiſtory rather of teaching than of acting, and, in reſpect of the room occupied, conſiſts in the relation of what was ſaid more than of what was done; I thought it of conſequence to diſtinguiſh the narrative part which comes directly from the Evangeliſt, from the interlocutory part (if I may uſe the expreſſion), or whatever was ſpoken either by our Lord himſelf, or by any of the perſons introduced into the work. To the former I have aſſiged the Italic, to the latter the Roman character. Though the latter branch in this diſtribution much exceeds in quantity the other, it is but a very inconſiderable part of that branch which is furniſhed by all the ſpeakers in the hiſtory, Jeſus alone excepted. Pretty long diſcourſes, which run through whole ſucceſſive chapters, are recorded as delivered by him without any interruption.

§ 12. Now my reaſons for adopting this method are the two following: Firſt, I was inclinable to render it evident to every reader at a ſingle glance, how ſmall a ſhare of the whole the ſacred penmen took upon themſelves. It is little, very little, which they ſay as from themſelves, except what is neceſſary for connecting the parts, and for acquainting us with the moſt important facts. Another reaſon for my taking this method was, becauſe in a few inſtances, a reader through not adverting cloſely, (and what reader is always ſecure againſt ſuch inadvertancy?) may not ſufficiently diſtinguiſh what is ſaid by the hiſtorian, from what is ſpoken by our Lord himſelf, or even by any of the other ſpeakers in a converſation reported of them. But it may be objected, 'May 'not this method ſometimes, in dubious caſes, con-'fine the interpretation in ſuch a way as to affect the ſenſe?' I acknowledge that this is poſſible; but it does not at preſent occur to my recollection, that there are caſes in theſe hiſtories, wherein any material change would be produced upon the ſenſe, in whichſoever of the two ways the words were underſtood. In moſt caſes it is evident, with a ſmall degree of attention, what are the words of the Evangeliſt the relater, and what are the words of the perſons whole converſations he relates.

§ 13. The principal uſe of the diſtinction here made is to quicken attention, or rather to ſupply a too common deficiency, which moſt readers are apt at intervals to experience, in attending. And even, at the worſt, it does not limit the ſenſe of the original in one inſtance out of twenty wherein it is limited by the pointing, which is now univerſally admited by critics to have been in later times ſuperadded. Indeed, there can be no tranſlation of any kind (for in tranſlating there is always a choice of one out of ſeveral meanings, of which a word is ſuſceptible) without ſuch limitations of the ſenſe. Yet the advantages of pointing and tranſlating are too conſiderable to be given up, on account of an inconvenience more apparent than real.

§ 14. All that is neceſſary in an interpreter, when the caſe is doubtful, is to remark in the notes the different ways in which the paſſage may be underſtood, after having placed in the text that which appears to him the moſt probable. In like manner, in the caſe under conſideration, wherever there is the leaſt ſcope for doubting whether the words be thoſe of the evangeliſt, or thoſe of any of the ſpeakers introduced into the hiſtory, I aſſign to the paſſage in this verſion, the character which, to the beſt of my judgment, ſuits it, giving in the notes the reaſons of my preference, together with what may be urged for viewing it differently. It is in effect the ſame rule which I follow in the caſe of various readings, and of words clearly ſuſceptible of different interpretations; alſo when an alteration in the pointing would yield a different ſenſe.

§ 15. It is proper to add a few things on the uſe I have made of the margin. And firſt of the ſide-

margin.

margin. One uſe has been already mentioned, to wit, for marking the chapters and verſes of the common diviſion. Beſide theſe, and a little further from the text, I have noted, in the outer margin, the parallel places in the other Goſpels, the paſſages of the Old Teſtament quoted or alluded to, and alſo the places in Scripture, and thoſe of the apocryphal writings, wherein the ſame ſentiment occurs, or the like incident is related. In this manner I have endeavoured to avoid the oppoſite extremes into which editors have fallen, either of crowding the margin with references to places whoſe only reſemblance was in the uſe of a ſimilar phraſe or identical expreſſion, or of overlooking thoſe paſſages wherein there is a material coincidence in the thought. To prevent, as much as poſſible, the confuſion ariſing from too many references, and figures in the margin, and at the ſame time to omit nothing uſeful, I have, at the beginning of every paragraph, referred firſt to the parallel places, when there are ſuch places, in the other Goſpels. As generally the reſemblance or coincidence affects more than one verſe, nay, ſometimes, runs through the whole of a paragraph; I have made the reference to the firſt verſe of the correſponding paſſage ſerve for a reference to the whole; and, in order to diſtinguiſh ſuch a reference from that to a ſingle verſe or ſentence, I have marked the former by a point at the upper corner of the figure, the latter by a point at the lower corner, as is uſual at the end of a ſentence. I have adopted the ſame method in references to the Old Teſtament, to mark the difference between thoſe where one verſe only is quoted or alluded to, and thoſe wherein the alluſion is to two or more in ſucceſſion.—Theſe are the only purpoſes to which I have appropriated the ſide-margin.

To give there a literal verſion of the peculiarities of idiom, whether Hebraiſms or Greciſms, of the original, and all the poſſible ways in which the words may otherwiſe be rendered, has never appeared to me an object deſerving a tenth part of the attention and time, which it requires from a tranſlator. To the learned ſuch information is of no ſignificancy. To thoſe who are juſt beginning the ſtudy of the language, it may indeed give a little aſſiſtance. To thoſe who underſtand only the language of the tranſlation, it is, in my judgment, rather prejudicial than uſeful, ſuggeſting doubts which readers of this ſtamp are not qualified for ſolving, and which often a little knowledge in philology would entirely diſſipate. All that is requiſite is, where there is a real ambiguity in the text, to conſider it in the notes. As therefore the only valuable purpoſe that ſuch marginal information can anſwer, is to beginners in the ſtudy of the ſacred languages, and as that purpoſe ſo little coincides with the deſign of a tranſlation of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, I could not diſcover the ſmalleſt propriety in giving it a place in this work.

§ 16. THE foot-margin I have reſerved for different purpoſes; firſt, for the explanation of ſuch appellatives, as do not admit a proper tranſlation into our language, and as, by conſequence, render it neceſſary for the tranſlator to retain the original term. This I did not conſider as a proper ſubject for the notes, which are reſerved chiefly for what requires criticiſm and argument: whereas all the explanations requiſite in the margin, are commonly ſuch as do not admit a queſtion among the learned. Brief explanations, ſuch as thoſe here meant, may be juſtly conſidered as eſſential to every tranſlation into which there is a neceſſity of introducing foreign words. The terms which require ſuch explanations, to wit, the names of peculiar offices, ſects, feſtivals, ceremonies, coins, meaſures, and the like, were conſidered formerly (*x*). Of certain terms, however, which come under ſome of theſe denominations, I have not judged it neceſſary to give any marginal explanation. The reaſon is, as they frequently occur in the ſacred books, what is mentioned there concerning them, ſufficiently explains the import of the words. The diſtinction of Phariſee and Sadducee, we learn chiefly from the Goſpel itſelf; and in the Old Teſtament, we are made acquainted with the ſabbath, circumciſion, and paſſover.

Thoſe things which ſtand moſt in need of a marginal explanation, are offices, coins, meaſures, and ſuch peculiarities in dreſs as their phylacteries and tufts or taſſels at the corners of their mantles. In like manner their diviſion of time, even when it does not occaſion the introduction of exotic terms, is apt to miſlead the unlearned, as it differs widely from the diviſion which obtains with us. Thus we ſhould not readily take the third hour of the day to mean nine o'clock in the morning, or the ſixth hour to mean noon. Further, when to Hebrew or Syriac expreſſions an explanation is ſubjoined in the text, as is given of the words, "Talitha cumi, immanuel, "ephphatha," and of our Lord's exclamation on the croſs, there is no occaſion for the aid of the margin. When no explanation is given in the text, as in the caſe of the word *hoſanna*, I have ſupplied it on the margin. Of the etymological ſignification of proper names, I have given an account only when there is in the text an alluſion to their etymology, in which

(*x*) Diſſ. VIII.

which caſe to know the primitive import of the term is neceſſary for underſtanding the alluſion.

§ 17. There is only one other uſe to which I have applied the foot-margin. The Greek word κυριος was employed by the Seventy, not only for rendering the Hebrew word *adon*, that is, *lord* or *maſter*, but alſo to ſupply the word JEHOVAH, which was uſed by the Jews as the proper name of God, but which a ſpecies of ſuperſtition, that by degrees came generally to prevail among them, hindered them from tranſplanting into the Greek language. As the name *Jehovah*, therefore, was peculiarly appropriated to God, and, as the Hebrew *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*, like the Latin *dominus*, and the Engliſh *lord*, are merely appellatives, and uſed promiſcuouſly of God, angels, and men, I thought it not improper, when a paſſage in the New Teſtament is quoted or introduced from the Old, wherein the word rendered in Greek *kyrios*, is in Hebrew *Jehovah*, to mark this name in the margin. At the ſame time let it be obſerved, that I have made no difference in the text of the verſion, inaſmuch as no difference is made in the text of the Evangeliſts my original, but have uſed the common Engliſh name *Lord* in addreſſing God, where they have employed the common Greek name *kyrios*.

PART V.

The Notes.

I SHALL now conclude with laying a few things before the reader, for opening more fully my deſign in the notes ſubjoined to this verſion. I have in the title denominated them critical and explanatory: *explanatory*, to point out the principal intention of them, which is to throw light upon the text, where it ſeems needful for the diſcovery of the direct and grammatical meaning; *critical*, to denote the means principally employed for this purpoſe, to wit, the rules of criticiſm on manuſcripts and verſions, in what concerns language, ſtyle, and idiom. I have called them *notes* rather than annotations, to ſuggeſt that, as much as poſſible, I have ſtudied brevity, and avoided expatiating on any topic. For this reaſon, when the import of the text is ſo evident as to need no illuſtration, I have purpoſely avoided diverting the reader's attention, by an unneceſſary diſplay of quotations from ancient authors, ſacred or profane. As I would with-hold nothing of real utility, I recur to claſſical authority, when it appears neceſſary, but not when a recourſe to it might be charged with oſtentation. A commentary was not intended, and therefore, any thing like a continued explanation of the text is not to be expected. The criticiſms and remarks here offered are properly *ſcholia*, or gloſſes on paſſages of doubtful or difficult interpretation; and not comments. The author is to be conſidered as merely a *ſcholiaſt*, not a commentator. Thus much may ſuffice as to the general deſign. In regard to ſome things, it will be proper to be more particular.

§ 2. FROM the ſhort account of my plan here given, it may naturally and juſtly be inferred, that I have ſhunned entirely the diſcuſſion of abſtract theological queſtions, which have afforded inexhauſtible matter of contention, not in the ſchools only, but in the church, and have been the principal ſubject of many commentaries of great name. To avoid controverſy of every kind is, I acknowledge, not to be attempted by one who, in his remarks on Scripture, often finds himſelf obliged to ſupport controverted interpretations of paſſages concerning the ſenſe of which there are various opinions. But queſtions of this kind, though ſometimes related to, are hardly ever coincident with, the ſpeculative points of polemic theology. The latter are but dededuced, and for the moſt part indirectly, from the former. Even controvertiſts have ſometimes the candour (though a claſs of men not remarkable for candour) to admit the juſtneſs of a grammatical interpretation which appears to favour an antagoniſt; no doubt believing, that the deduction, made by him from the text, may be eluded otherwiſe than by a different verſion.—But my reaſons, for keeping as clear as poſſible of all ſcholaſtic diſputes, are the following:

§ 3. FIRST,

§ 3. First, if, in such a work as this, a man were disposed to admit them, it is impossible to say how far they would, or should, carry him. The different questions which have been agitated, have all, as parts of the same system, some connection, natural or artificial, among themselves. The explanation and defence of one draws in, almost necessarily, the explanation and defence of another on which it depends. Besides, those conversant in systematic divinity, scarcely read a verse in the Gospel, which they do not imagine capable of being employed plausibly, or which, perhaps, they have not seen or heard employed, either in defending, or in attacking, some of their dogmas. Whichsoever of these be the case, the staunch polemic finds himself equally obliged, for what he reckons the cause of truth, to discuss the controversy. I know no way so proper for escaping such endless embarrassments, as to make it a rule to admit no questions but those which serve to evince either the authentic reading, or the just rendering of the text.

§ 4. My second reason is, I have not known any interpreter who has meddled with controversy, whose translation is not very sensibly injured by it. Disputation is a species of combat: the desire of victory is natural to combatants, and is commonly, the further they engage, found to become the more ardent. Will the fairness and impartiality of a professed disputant, who being, at the same time, a translator, has, in some measure, in the latter capacity, the moulding of the arguments to which, in the former, he must recur, be deemed, in the office of translating, greatly to be depended on? A man, however honest in his intentions, ought not to trust himself in such a case. Under so powerful a temptation, it is often impossible to preserve the judgment unbiassed, though the will should remain uncorrupted. And I am strongly inclined to think that, if Beza had not accompanied his translation with his controversial commentary, he would not have been capable of such flagrant wresting of the words, and perversion of the sense of his author, as he is sometimes justly chargeable with. But, in rendering a passage in the version, to be presently converted into an argument in the annotations, it was not easy for a translator of so great ardour, to refrain from giving it the turn that would best suit the purpose, of which, as annotator, he never lost sight, and for which both version and commentary seem to have been undertaken, the defence of the theology of his party.

§ 5. My third reason for declining all such disputes is, because the much greater part of them, even those which are treated by the disputants on both sides as very important, have long appeared to me in no other light than that of the foolish questions which the Apostle warns Titus to avoid (*y*), as unprofitable and vain; or of the profane babblings and oppositions of science, falsely so called, against which he repeatedly cautioned Timothy (*z*). If we may judge of them by their effects, as of the tree by its fruits, we shall certainly be led to this conclusion. For, from the marks which the Apostle has given of the *logomachies*, or strifes of words, then beginning to prevail, we have the utmost reason to conclude, that a great proportion of our scholastic disputes comes under the same denomination. What character has he given of the vain janglings of his day, which is wanting in those of ours? Do not the latter gender contention as successfully as ever the former did? Cannot we say, with as much truth of these, as Paul did of those, "whereof cometh envy, "strife, revilings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings "of men of corrupt minds?" Do our babblings, any more than theirs, minister godly edifying? Do they not, on the contrary, with equal speed, when they are encouraged, encrease unto more ungodliness? Have our polemic divines, by their abstruse researches and metaphysical refinements, contributed to the advancement of charity, love to God, and love to man? Yet this is, in religion, the great end of all; for charity is the end of the commandment, and the bond of perfectness. These questions I leave with every considerate reader. The proper answers will, with the aid of a little experience and reflection, be so quickly suggested to him, that he will need no prompter.

§ 6. Lastly, Though I am far from putting all questions in theology on a level, the province of the translator, and that of the controvertist, are so distinct, and the talents requisite in the one, so different from those requisite in the other, that it appears much better to keep them separate. I have, therefore, in this work, confined myself entirely to the former.

§ 7. Further, I do not attempt, in the notes, to remove every kind of textuary difficulty in the books here translated; such, for example, as arise from apparent contradictions in the accounts of the different Evangelists, or from the supposed contradiction of cotemporary authors, or such as are merely chronological or geographical. Not that I consider these, like the dogmas of the controvertist, as without the sphere of a critic on the sacred text; not that I make it, as in the former case, a rule to exclude them, if any

(*y*) Tit. iii. 9.

(*z*) 1 Tim. i. 4. vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 23.

any thing new and ſatisfactory ſhould occur to me to offer; but becauſe, on moſt queſtions of this nature, all the methods of ſolution, known to me, are either trite or unſatisfactory. Much has been written for ſolving the difficulty ariſing from the different accounts given of our Lord's genealogy by Matthew and Luke; and different hypotheſis have been framed for this purpoſe. Though I do not pretend to have reached certainty on this queſtion, I incline moſt to the opinion of thoſe who make the one account the pedigree of Joſeph, the other that of Mary. But having nothing to advance which has not been already ſaid over and over by others, and the evidence not being ſuch as to put the matter beyond doubt; I ſee no occaſion for a note, barely to tell my opinion, which is entitled to no regard from the reader, unleſs ſo far as it is ſupported by evidence.

For ſimilar reaſons, I have avoided entering upon the examination of the difficulties occaſioned by the different accounts given of our Lord's reſurrection, and his appearance to his diciples after it. On ſome of theſe points there is a danger leſt an interpreter be too haſty in deciding. A judgment raſhly formed may give his mind ſuch a bias as ſhall affect his tranſlation, and lead him to make ſtretches in ſupport of his opinion, which the laws of criticiſm do not warrant. I acknowledge, on the other hand, that there are inſtances wherein a ſmall variation, very defenſible in the pointing, or in rendering a particular expreſſion, may totally remove a difficulty or apparent contradiction. In ſuch a caſe, it would be both uncandid and injudicious, not to give that, of all the interpretations whereof the words are ſuſceptible, which is attended with the leaſt difficulty; and, if the interpretation be uncommon, to aſſign the reaſons in the notes. But, to do violence to the rules of conſtruction, and diſtort the words, for the ſake of producing the ſolutions of a difficulty, is, in effect to ſubſtitute our own conjectures for the word of God, and thus to put off human conceit for celeſtial verity. It is far better to leave the matter as we found it. In ſolving difficulties to which we find ourſelves unequal, future expoſitors may be more ſucceſsful.

§ 8. One great fault, far too common with ſcriptural critics, is, that they would be thought to know every thing: and they are but too prone to think ſo concerning themſelves. This tends to retard (inſtead of accelerating) their progreſs in true knowledge. Men are unwilling to part with what they fancy they have gotten a ſure hold of, or to be eaſily ſtript of what has coſt them time and painful ſtudy to acquire. Cuſtom ſoon ſupplies the place of argument; and what at firſt may have appeared to be reaſon, ſettles into prejudice. It is neceſſary, in our preſent ſtate, that habit ſhould have influence even on our opinions. But it is particularly fortunate when the habit, in matters of judgment, extends not barely to the concluſions, but to the premiſes; not to the opinions only, but to the reaſons on which we have founded them. When this is the caſe, we experience all the advantages derived from an habitual aſſociation, without much danger of bigotry or blind attachment. Now it is well known, that opinions haſtily formed, preclude all the advantage which may afterwards redound from better information. The truth of this remark is, even in the ordinary affairs of life, too well ſeen and felt in its unhappy conſequences, every day.

§ 9. Again, I have, in theſe notes, avoided meddling with queſtions relating to the order in which the different miracles were performed, and the diſcourſes ſpoken, and alſo ſettling the doubts which have been raiſed concerning the identity or diverſity of ſome of the facts and ſpeeches recorded by the different Evangeliſts. I have ſhunned, in like manner, all enquiry about the time occupied by our Lord's miniſtry, and about ſeveral other hiſtorical queſtions which have been much canvaſſed. I do not ſay that ſuch enquiries are uſeleſs. A connection with the evidence of other points, which may be of great importance, may confer on ſome of them a conſequence, much beyond what at firſt we ſhould be apt to imagine. But, in general, I do not heſitate to affirm, that though I have occaſionally attended to ſuch enquiries, I have not been able to diſcover that their conſequence is ſo great as ſome ſeem to make it. They are ſtill, upon the whole, rather curious than uſeful. Beſides, on the greater part of them, little is to be expected beyond uncertainty and doubt.

Some people have ſo ſtrong a propenſity to form fixt opinions on every ſubject to which they turn their thoughts, that their mind will brook no delay. They cannot bear to doubt or heſitate. Suſpenſe in judging, is to them more inſufferable, than the manifeſt hazard of judging wrong: and therefore, when they have not ſufficient evidence, they will form an opinion from what they have, be it ever ſo little; or even from their own conjectures, without any evidence at all. Now, to believe without proper evidence, and to doubt when we have evidence ſufficient, are equally the effects, not of the ſtrength, but of the weakneſs of the underſtanding. In queſtions, therefore, which have appeared to me either unimportant, or of very dubious ſolution, I have thought it better to be ſilent, than to amuſe the

reader with thoſe remarks in which I have myſelf found no ſatisfaction. In a very few caſes, however, I have, in ſome meaſure, departed from this rule; and, in order to prevent the reader from being miſled in a matter of conſequence, by explanations more ſpecious than ſolid, have even attempted to refute thoſe ſolutions given by others, which appeared to pervert the ſenſe, though I had nothing ſatisfactory of my own to ſubſtitute in their place (*a*). Having ſaid thus much of the purpoſes for which the notes are not, it is proper now, to mention thoſe for which they are, intended.

§ 10. FIRST, then, as was hinted before, ſuch different readings as affect the ſenſe, and are tolerably ſupported by manuſcripts, verſions, or their own intrinſic evidence, inſomuch, that the judgments of the learned are divided concerning them, are commonly given in the notes; their evidence briefly ſtated, and the reaſon aſſigned for the reading adopted in the tranſlation. In this I carefully avoid all minuteneſs, having no intention to uſurp the province, or ſuperſede the labours, of thoſe who have, with ſo much laudable care and diligence, collected thoſe variations, and thereby facilitated the work of other critics. Indeed, as the variations are comparatively few, which are entitled to a place here; and as in thoſe few I do not enter into particulars, but only give what appears the reſult of the evidence on both ſides, I cannot be ſaid, in any reſpect, to interfere with the departments of ſuch critics as Mill and Wetſtein. The little which occurs here ought, on the contrary, to ſerve as a ſpur to the learned reader, to the more aſſiduous ſtudy of this important branch of ſacred literature. In like manner, variations of conſequence, affecting the ſenſe, in verſions of ſuch venerable antiquity as the Syriac and the Vulgate, though not accompanied with correſpondent readings in any Greek copies, are not often paſſed over unobſerved. In all dubious caſes, I give my reaſon for the reading preferred in this tranſlation. whether it be the common reading or not; and, after mentioning the other, with what may be urged in its favour, leave the reader to his choice.

§ 11. THE other, and the principal end of theſe notes, is to aſſign the reaſons for the way wherein the words or ſentences of the original are rendered in this tranſlation. As it would have been improper, becauſe unneceſſary, to give a reaſon for the manner wherein every word, or even ſentence, is tranſlated, I ſhall here mention the particular caſes in which it has been judged expedient to offer ſomething in the notes in vindication of the verſion. The firſt is, when the rendering given to the words does not coincide in meaning with that of the common verſion. Where the difference is manifeſtly and only in expreſſion, to make remarks muſt generally appear ſuperfluous; the matter ought to be left to the taſte and diſcernment of the reader. To attempt a defence of every alteration of this kind, would both extend the notes to an unmeaſurable length, and render them, for the moſt part, very inſignificant.

But, ſecondly, there are a few inſtances wherein all the difference in the verſion may, in fact, be merely verbal, though not manifeſtly ſo; and therefore as, to the generality of readers, they will at firſt appear to affect the ſenſe, it may be of conſequence to take notice of them. The difference between ſound and ſenſe, the words and the meaning, though clearly founded in the nature of things, is not always ſo obvious as we ſhould imagine. That, in language, the connection between the ſign and the thing ſignified, is merely artificial, cannot admit a queſtion. Yet, the tendency of the mind, when much habituated to particular ſounds, as the ſigns of certain conceptions, is to put both on the footing of things naturally connected. In conſequence of this, a difference only in expreſſion may appear to alter the ſentiment, or, at leaſt, very much to enervate and obſcure it. For this reaſon, in a few caſes, wherein the change made on the place is, in effect, merely verbal, I have, to obviate miſtakes, and to ſhow that, in alterations even of this kind, I have been determined by reaſons which appear to me weighty, attempted a brief illuſtration in the notes.

Thirdly, in certain caſes, wherein there is no difference between the common tranſlation and the preſent, either in thought or in expreſſion, but wherein both differ from that of other reſpectable interpreters, or wherein the common verſion has been combated by learned critics, I have aſſigned my reaſons for concurring with the Engliſh tranſlators, and for not being determined by ſuch criticiſms, though ingenious, and though ſupported by writers of character. This is the more neceſſary, as there has been, of late, both abroad and at home, a profuſion of criticiſms on the ſacred text; and many new verſions have been attempted, eſpecially in France and England. As theſe muſt be ſuppoſed to have had ſome influence on critical readers, it would have been improper to overlook entirely their remarks. Such, therefore, as ſeem to be of moment, and have come to my knowledge, or occurred to my

(*a*) See the note on Mark, x. 30.

my memory, I have occaſionally taken notice of. This I have done, with a view ſometimes to confirm their reaſoning, ſometimes to confute it, or, at leaſt, to ſhow that it is not ſo deciſive as a ſanguine philologiſt (for even philologiſts are ſometimes ſanguine in deciding) is apt to imagine. In this article, the learned reader will find many omiſſions, ariſing partly from forgetfulneſs, and partly from the different judgments which are inevitably formed, by different perſons, concerning the importance of particular criticiſms. When the deciſion of any point may be ſaid to depend, in whole or in part, on what has been diſcuſſed in the Preliminary Diſſertations, I always, to avoid repetitions, refer to the paragraph or paragraphs of the Diſſertation, where ſuch a diſcuſſion is to be found.

§ 12. ANOTHER purpoſe for which I have ſometimes employed the notes, is the explanation of a name, or word which, though from ſcriptural uſe it be familiar to our ears, has little currency in converſation, becauſe rarely or never applied to any common ſubject. Of this kind are the words *parable*, *publican*, *ſcribe*, of which I have attempted an explanation in the notes: add to theſe all the terms which, though current in converſation, have ſomething peculiar in their ſcriptural application. I have generally avoided employing words in meanings which they never bear in ordinary uſe. As it is from the prevailing uſe that words, as ſigns, may be ſaid to originate, and by it that their import is aſcertained, ſuch peculiarities rarely fail to create ſome obſcurity. There are, nevertheleſs, inſtances in all languages, in which, on certain ſubjects (for religion is not ſingular in this), common terms have ſomething peculiar in their application. In ſuch caſes, we cannot avoid the peculiarity of meaning, without having recourſe to circumlocution, or ſuch other expedients as would injure the ſimplicity of the expreſſion, and give the appearance of affectation to the language. When, therefore, I have thought it neceſſary to employ ſuch words, I have endeavoured to aſcertain the ſcriptural acceptation in the notes; or, if the explanation has been anticipated in theſe Diſſertations, I have referred to the place. Of ſuch peculiarities, which are far from being numerous in this verſion, the following will ſerve as examples.

The firſt ſhall be the word *lawyer*, which I have, after the old tranſlators retained, as the verſion of νομικος; not that it entirely anſwers in the Goſpel to the Engliſh uſe, but becauſe it has what I may call an analogical propriety, and bears nearly the ſame relation to their word νομος, that the word *lawyer* bears to our word *law*. The deviation from common uſe is at moſt not greater than that of the words *patron* and *client* in the tranſlation of any Roman hiſtorian. Some, indeed, have choſen to render νομικος *ſcribe*, and others, for the ſame reaſon, to render γραμματευς *lawyer*, becauſe in one inſtance, a perſon called νομικος in one Goſpel (*b*), is named in another (*c*) γραμματευς. But this argument is not concluſive. *Jonathan, David's uncle*, we are told (*d*), *was a counſellor, a wiſe man, and a ſcribe*. Can we infer from this, that theſe are ſynonomous words? The contrary, I think, may be concluded with much greater reaſon. If then, Jonathan had been called by one hiſtorian barely a *counſellor*, and by another barely a *ſcribe*, it would not have been juſt to infer that *counſellor* and *ſcribe*, though both, in this inſtance, applicable to the ſame perſon, are words of the ſame import. Yet the argument is no better in the preſent caſe. That there is, however, an affinity in their ſignifications can hardly be doubted, as both belonged to the literary profeſſion, which was not very extenſive among the Jews. But that they are not entirely coincident, may be inferred from a paſſage in Luke (*e*), where we are informed that our Lord, after ſeverely cenſuring the practices of the Scribes, γραμματεις, and Phariſees, is addreſſed in this manner by one of the νομικοι, who happened to be preſent, *Maſter, thus ſaying, thou reproacheſt us alſo*. That the reproach extended to them he infers from the thing ſaid, *thus ſaying*, but there had been no occaſion for inference, if they had been addreſſed by their common appellation, and if *ſcribe* and *lawyer* had meant the ſame thing. Neither, in that caſe, could he have ſaid *us alſo*, that is, *us* as well as thoſe whom thou haſt named, the Scribes and Phariſees. Our Lord's reply makes it, if poſſible ſtill more evident, that though what he had ſaid did indeed comprehend them, the title which he had uſed did not neceſſarily imply ſo much. *Wo unto* YOU ALSO, *ye lawyers*, ΚΑΙ ΥΜΙΝ τοις νομικοις και (*f*), which could not have been ſo expreſſed, if the denunciation immediately preceding had been addreſſed to them by name. Others think νομικος equivalent to νομοδιδασκαλος, rendering both *Doctor of the law*. But as we have not ſufficient evidence that there is in theſe a perfect coincidence in meaning, and as they are differently rendered in the Syriac verſion, it is better to preſerve the diſtinction which the original makes, at leaſt in the names.

Another example of a ſmall deviation from familiar language, is in the word *ſinner*, which, in common uſe, is applicable to every rational being not morally perfect, but frequently in Scripture denotes a perſon

(*b*) Matth. xxii. 35.
(*c*) Mark, xii. 28.
(*d*) 1 Chron. xxvii. 32.
(*e*) Luke, xi. 45.
(*f*) Luke, xi. 46.

a perſon of a profligate life. Now as the frequency of this application, and the nature of the occurrences, remove all doubt as to the meaning, it may be conſidered as one of thoſe Hebrew idioms, which it is proper in a tranſlator to preſerve. Neither *deſert* nor *wilderneſs* exactly correſponds to ερημος in the New Teſtament; but they are near enough to anſwer the purpoſe better than a periphraſis. The like may be ſaid of *neighbour*, which, in familiar language, is never uſed with ſo great latitude as in holy writ. And in general, when words in ſcriptural uſe are accompanied with perſpicuity, they ought to be preferred to words in greater currency, which are not uſed in the common tranſlation; and that even though the import of theſe more familiar words ſhould be ſufficiently appoſite. It is for this reaſon alone, that, in relation to human characters, we ſhould reckon it more ſuitable to the language of the Spirit, to ſay *righteous* than virtuous, *juſt* than honeſt.

§ 13. THE only other uſe I have made of the notes, and that but ſeldom, is to remark paſſingly what may ſerve either to illuſtrate the character of the ſtyle of thoſe writings, or to diſplay the ſpirit which everywhere animates them: for in theſe we diſcover the intrinſic evidences they carry of a divine original. This has induced me ſometimes to take notice alſo of the moral leſſons to which ſome things naturally lead the attention of the ſerious reader. There is not on this ground the ſame hazard, as on the ſpeculative queſtions of ſchool-divinity, of rouſing even among Chriſtians a whole hoſt of opponents, or ſtirring up unedifying and undeterminable diſputes. Practical obſervations, though too little minded, are hardly ever controverted. Beſides, they are not of that kind of queſtions which genders ſtrife, but are moſt evidently of that which miniſters godly edifying. On this article ſome will think that I have been too ſparing. But, in my judgment, it is only in very particular caſes, that the introduction of ſuch hints is pertinent in a ſcholiaſt. When the ſcope of the text is manifeſtly practical, it is enough that we attend to the ſacred authors. To enforce what they ſay by obtruding on the reader remarks to the ſame purpoſe, might appear a ſuperfluous, or even officious, interruption. The effect is fully as bad when the obſervation, however good in itſelf, appears farfetched: for the beſt things do not anſwer out of place. Perhaps the leaſt exceptionable account that can be given of ſuch remarks as are at once pertinent and efficacious, is, that they ariſe naturally, though not obviouſly, out of the ſubject.

§ 14. To conclude; as I do not think it the beſt way of giving an impartial hearing to the ſacred authors to interrupt the reading of them every moment, for the ſake of conſulting either the gloſſes or the annotations of expoſitors, I have avoided offering any temptation to this practice, having placed the notes at the end. When a portion of Scripture, ſuch as one of the ſections of this verſion, is intended to be read, it is better to read it to an end without interruption. The ſcope of the whole is in this way more clearly perceived, as well as the connection of the parts. Whereas, when the reader finds the text and the notes in the ſame page, and under his eye at once, the latter tend, too evidently, to awake his curioſity, and before he has proceeded in the former far enough to have a diſtinct view of the ſcope of the paſſage, to call off his attention; but when they are ſeparated, as in this work, it may be ſuppoſed, that a reader will finiſh at leaſt a paragraph, before he turn over to a diſtant part of the book. This method gives this advantage even to the notes, if judicious, that as the argument there uſed in favour of a particular reading, or of a particular rendering of a ſentence, is often drawn from the ſcope and connection of the place, he will be better qualified to judge of the juſtneſs of the criticiſm. It ought always to be remembered that an acquaintance with the text is the principal object. Recourſe to the notes may be had only occaſionally, as a man, when he meets with ſome difficulty, and is at a loſs how to determine, recurs to the judgment of a friend. For the ſame reaſon I have alſo avoided inſerting any marks in the text referring to them. The reference is ſufficiently aſcertained in the notes themſelves, by the common marks of chapter and verſe.

THE END OF THE PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS.

PREFACE

TO

MATTHEW's GOSPEL.

THE time when this Goſpel was compoſed, has not been preciſely aſcertained by the learned. Some thave thought that it was written no more than eight years after our Lord's aſcenſion; others have reckoned it no fewer than fifteen. All antiquity ſeems agreed in the opinion, that it was of all the Goſpels the firſt publiſhed; and, in a caſe of this kind, I ſhould not think it prudent, unleſs for very ſtrong reaſons, to diſſent from their verdict. Of the few Chriſtian writers of the firſt century, whoſe works yet remain, there are in Barnabas, the companion of Paul, Clement of Rome, and Hermas, clear references to ſome paſſages of this hiſtory. For though the Evangeliſt is not named, and his words are not formally quoted, the attentive reader muſt be ſenſible that the author had read the Goſpel which has uniformly been aſcribed to Matthew, and that, on ſome occaſions, he plainly alludes to it. Very early in the ſecond century, Ignatius, in thoſe Epiſtles which are generally acknowledged to be genuine, and Polycarp, of whom we have no more but a ſingle letter remaining, have manifeſt alluſions to different parts of this Goſpel. The writers above named are thoſe who are denominated apoſtolic fathers, becauſe they were contemporary to the Apoſtles, and had been their diſciples. Their teſtimony, therefore, ſerves to ſhow not only their knowledge of this Book, but the great and general eſtimation wherein it was held from the beginning.

§ 2. THE firſt, indeed, upon record, who has named Matthew as the writer of this Goſpel, is Papias biſhop of Hierapolis in Ceſarea, who is ſaid to have been a companion of Polycarp, and hearer of John. Though Ireneus ſeems to think it was the Apoſtle John he meant, Euſebius, with greater probability, ſuppoſes it was a John who was commonly diſtinguiſhed from the Apoſtle by the appellation of *the elder*, or *the preſbyter*. Papias, in his preface, does not ſay that he had

heard or ſeen any of the apoſtles, but only that he had received every thing concerning the faith from thoſe who were well acquainted with them. Beſides, after naming the Apoſtle John, he mentions Ariſtion and John the elder, not as apoſtles, but as diſciples, of our Lord. Concerning Matthew, this venerable ancient affirms that *he wrote his Goſpel in the Hebrew tongue, which every one interpreted as he was able* (*a*). Here we have his teſtimony, firſt, that Matthew (who is alſo called Levi (*b*) was the writer of this Goſpel, for no other was ever aſcribed to him, and this was never aſcribed to another; and, ſecondly, that it was written in Hebrew.

§ 3. THE firſt of theſe teſtimonies has never, as far as I know, been controverted. On the contrary, it has been confirmed, and is ſtill ſupported by all ſubſequent Chriſtian authors who have touched the ſubject. The ſecond of theſe teſtimonies, that this Evangeliſt wrote his Goſpel in Hebrew, had a concurrence equally uniform of all ſucceeding writers in the church for about fourteen hundred years. In the laſt two centuries, however, this point has been hotly diſputed. Eraſmus, who, though an eminent ſcholar, knew little or nothing of Hebrew, was among the firſt who called in queſtion a tradition which had ſo long, and ſo univerſally, obtained in the church. "The faults of Eraſmus," ſays Simon (*c*), "were "blindly followed by cardinal Cajetan, who, not knowing either Greek or Hebrew, "was incapable of correcting them." The cardinal has ſince been almoſt deſerted by the Catholics; and the principal defenders of this new opinion have been Proteſtants. It is very unlucky for the diſcovery of truth, when party-ſpirit, in any degree, influences our inquiries. Yet, it is but too evident that there has been an infuſion of this ſpirit in the diſcuſſion of the preſent queſtion. 'If we give up,' ſays the ſtaunch polemic, 'the originality of the Greek text, we have no Goſpel 'by Matthew which can be called authentic; for, to admit that the tranſlation of 'one book of Scripture may be ſo denominated, is equally abſurd as to admit it of 'them all; and, if we admit this point, what becomes of our controverſy with the 'Romaniſts about the decree of the council of Trent, aſſerting the authenticity of the 'Vulgate?' Whitby, who enters warmly into this diſpute, urges (*d*), amongſt other things, the improbability that Providence, which has preſerved all the canonical books in their original languages, ſhould have ſuffered the original of this Goſpel to be ſo ſoon loſt, and nothing of it to remain in the church but a tranſlation. That all the books are extant which have been written by divine inſpiration, is not ſo clear a caſe as that author ſeems to imagine. It will hardly be pretended that it is ſelf-evident, and I have yet ſeen no attempt to prove it. The book of the wars of the Lord (*e*), the book of Jaſher (*f*), the book of Nathan the Prophet, the book of

(*a*) Ματθαιος μεν ουν Εβραιδι διαλεκτω τα λογια συνεταξατο· ηρμηνευσε δ' αυτα ως ηδυνατο εκαστος. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 39.

(*b*) Mark, ii. 14. Luke, v. 27. 29.

(*c*) Hiſt. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 5.

(*d*) Prefatory Diſc. to the Four Goſpels.

(*e*) Numb. xxi. 14.

(*f*) Joſ. x. 13.

of Gad the Seer (*g*), and ſeveral others, are referred to in the Old Teſtament, manifeſtly as of equal authority with the book which refers to them, and as fuller in in point of information. Yet theſe are, to all appearance, irrecoverably loſt. Other Epiſtles, beſide thoſe we have, there is reaſon to think the Apoſtles wrote by the ſame ſpirit. Further, is not what is ſpoken, equally valuable with what is written, by inſpiration? Yet how ſmall a portion of the words of Him *who ſpake as never man ſpake*, has it pleaſed Providence to cauſe to be committed to writing? How little comparatively is recorded of the diſcourſes of thoſe poor fiſhermen of Galilee, whoſe eloquence, in ſpite of all its diſadvantages, baffled the wiſdom of the learned, the power of the mighty, and the influence of the rich, converting infidels and idolaters, by thouſands, to a doctrine to which all their education, prejudices, and paſſions, rendered them moſt reluctant, the doctrine of the crucified Meſſiah? God beſtows his favours, both ſpiritual and temporal, in various meaſure, to different individuals, nations, and ages, of the world, as he thinks fit. Thoſe of former times enjoyed many advantages which we have not, and we enjoy ſome which they had not. It is enough for us, that this only is required as our duty, that we make the proper uſe of the Scriptures, and of all the other advantages which, through the Goodneſs of God, we enjoy: for every man is *accepted according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not* (*h*).

But indeed this mode of arguing with regard to Providence, appears to me quite unſatisfactory, as proceeding on the notion that we are judges in matters which, in my opinion, are utterly beyond the reach of our faculties. Men imagining themſelves to know perfectly what it is proper for the Ruler of the univerſe, in any ſuppoſed circumſtance, to do, conclude boldly that he has done this or that, after ſuch a particular manner, or ſuch another: a method which, in a creature like man, can hardly be accounted either modeſt or pious. From the motives by which men are commonly influenced, we may judge, with ſome likelihood, what in particular circumſtances their conduct will be. This is level to our capacity, and within the ſphere of our experience. But let us not preſume to meaſure the acts of Omnipotence and of Infinite Wiſdom by our contracted ſpan. Were we, from our notions of convenience, to determine what God, in poſſible caſes, real or hypothetical, has done, or would do, we ſhould without heſitation, pronounce that the autographies, the identical writings of the ſacred penmen (which are in ſtrictneſs the only originals or perfect ſtandards), would have been preſerved from accidents, that they might ſerve for correcting all the corruptions which ſhould, in proceſs of time, be introduced through the miſtakes, the careleſſneſs, or the bad intention, of tranſcribers. For who can deny that the ſenſe of a writing may be as much injured by the blunders of a copyiſt, as by thoſe of a tranſlator? But if thoſe have not the Goſpel, who cannot have recourſe to ſome copy in the original language, not the ten thouſandth part of thoſe called Chriſtians, have yet partaken in that ineſtimable bleſſing. For how ſmall, comparatively, is the number of thoſe

(*g*) 1 Chron. xxix. 29. (*h*) 2 Cor. viii. 12.

who can read the ſacred writers in their own languages? If, therefore, it is truth we deſire, and not the confirmation of our prejudices, let us renounce all ſuch deluſive reaſonings *a priori* from ſuppoſed fitneſſes, of which we are far, very far indeed, from being competent judges; and let us ſatisfy ourſelves with examining impartially the evidences of the fact.

§ 4. THE proper evidence of ancient facts is written teſtimony. And for this fact, as was obſerved before, we have the teſtimony of Papias, as Euſebius, who quotes his words, aſſures us. For a fact of this kind, a more proper witneſs than Papias could hardly be deſired: if not a contemporary of the Apoſtles, or rather, if not known to them, a contemporary of their diſciples, and who had been a hearer of two men, Ariſtion, and John the elder, whom he calls diſciples of the Lord. He was one, therefore, who had it in his power to be certified of any fact relating to the miniſtry of the Apoſtles, and that by perſons who had been intimately acquainted with them. Now, by the character tranſmitted to us of Papias, he was particularly inquiſitive about the ſayings and actions of our Lord; and, for this purpoſe, cultivated an acquaintance with thoſe who had ſeen and heard him, and could give him the fulleſt information of all that he did and taught. "I took no "delight," ſays he, "as moſt people do, in thoſe who talk much, but in thoſe who "teach the truth; nor in thoſe who relate ſtrange precepts, but in thoſe who relate "the precepts which the lord hath entruſted us with, and which proceed from the "truth itſelf." It would not be eaſy for me to imagine what could be objected to ſo clear an evidence in ſo plain a caſe, a matter of fact which falls within the reach even of the loweſt underſtanding; for this is one of thoſe points, on which, if the ſimpleſt man alive ſhould deviate from truth, every man of ſenſe would impute his deviation to a defect of a very different kind from that of underſtanding. Yet this is the only reſource to which thoſe who controvert the teſtimony of Papias, have betaken themſelves.

§ 5. EUSEBIUS had ſaid of Papias (*i*), that "he was a man of ſlender parts, as may "be diſcovered from his writings." This the hiſtorian mentions, in order to account for the ſentiments of that ancient writer concerning the millennium, who, in the opinion of Euſebius, interpreted too literally and groſsly, what the Apoſtles had ſeen meet to veil under figurative language. But not to enter here into the nature of Chriſt's reign for a thouſand years on the earth, before the general reſurrection (a queſtion foreign to the preſent purpoſe; and on which, if Papias erred, he erred along with many not deficient in underſtanding), a man may be very unfit for judging rightly of a theological or critical queſtion, who would be allowed, by every perſon of common ſenſe, a competent witneſs in queſtions of plain fact, which had fallen under his obſervation; as whether Matthew had been accounted, from

(*i*) Σφοδρα γαρ τοι σμικρος ων τον νουν, ως αν εκ των αυτε λογων, τετμημενον εικοτως φαινεται. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 39.

from the beginning, the writer of such a Gospel, and whether he wrote it in Hebrew or in Greek.

§ 6. It seems to be another objection to the testimony of Papias, that he adds, "which every one interpreted as he was able:" as if he could be understood to mean, that every one was able to interpret Hebrew. This clause is an elliptical idiom of that sort, to which something similar, in familiar conversation, will be found to occur in most languages. Nobody is at a loss to perceive the meaning to be, 'For 'some time there was no interpretation in common use, but every one who at-'tempted interpreting, did it the best way he could.' The manner in which this addition is made is, to me, on the contrary, a confirmation of the testimony; as it leads me to think (but in this I may be deceived), that Papias had not from testimony this part of the information he gives; but that it was what he himself remembered, when there was no version of Matthew's Gospel generally received, but every one who could read it in its own language, Hebrew, and either in writing or in speaking had recourse to it, translated it as well as he could. Thus, our Scottish Highlanders may say, at this moment, that, till very lately, they had no translation of the Bible into their mother-tongue, that they had only the English Bible, which every one interpreted to them as he was able. Could a reasonable person, on hearing such a declaration, imagine that any thing had been advanced, which could be called either absurd or unintelligible?

§ 7. The next authority I shall recur to is that of Ireneus bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who in his youth had been a disciple to Polycarp. He says (*k*), in the only book of his extant, that "Matthew, among the Hebrews, wrote a Gospel in their "own language, whilst Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome, and "founding the church there." And in a fragment of the same author, which Grabe and others have published, it is said, "The Gospel according to Matthew "was written to the Jews; for they earnestly desired a Messiah of the posterity of "David. Matthew, in order to satisfy them in this point, began his Gospel with "the genealogy of Jesus."

§ 8. The third witness to be adduced is Origen, who flourished in the former part of the third century. He is quoted by Eusebius, in a chapter (*l*) wherein he specially treats of Origin's account of the sacred canon. "As I have learnt," says Origen, "by tradition, concerning the four Gospels, which alone are received, "without dispute, by the whole church of God under heaven; the first was written "by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, *who de-*"*livered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language.* Εκδιδωκοτα αυτο "τοις

(*k*) Ὁ μεν δη Ματθαιος εν τοις Ἑβραιοις τη ιδια διαλεκτω αυτων, και γραφην εξηνεγκεν ευαγγελιου, τυ Πετρυ και τυ Παυλυ εν Ρωμη ευαγγελιζομενων, και, θεμελιουντων την εκκλησιαν. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. cap. 8.

(*l*) Hist. lib. vi. cap. 25.

" τοις απο ιουδαισμου πιστευσασι, γραμμασιν Εβραικοις συντεταγμενον." In another place he says (*m*), " We " begin with Matthew, who, according to tradition, wrote first, publishing his " Gospel to the Hebrews, or the believers who were of the circumcision." Again (*n*), " Matthew, writing for the Hebrews, who expected him who was to descend " from Abraham and David, says, The lineage of Jesus Christ, son of David, son " of Abraham." Let it here be observed, by the way, that the word παραδοσις, as used by ancient writers, and sometimes by the sacred penmen, does not entirely coincide in meaning with our word *tradition*. I have here, however, employed this word with the common run of interpreters, that I might not be thought desirous of saying more in the version than the original warrants. The word *tradition*, with us, imports, as the English lexicographer rightly explains it, " any thing delivered " orally from age to age:" whereas παραδοσις properly implies, " any thing handed " down from former ages, in whatever way it has been transmitted, whether by " oral or by written testimony; or even any instruction conveyed to others, either " by word or by writing." In this last acceptation we find it used in Scripture (*o*): *Hold the traditions*, τας παραδοσεις, *which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle.* It is only when the epithet αγραφος, *unwritten*, is added to παραδοσις, that it answers exactly to the English word; whereas all historical evidence comes under the denomination παραδοσις. In this acceptation of the term, therefore, to say we have such a thing *by tradition*, is the same as to say, in English, " we have this " account transmitted from former ages." In Papias and Ireneus there is no mention of *tradition*. They spoke of what they knew, as they had immediate and most credible attestations from those who were acquainted with the writers of the Gospels, and with every circumstance relating to the publication. Their manner of expressing themselves on this head, is that of men who had the certain knowledge of what they affirm, and therefore consider it as indisputable.

§ 9. It would be endless to bring authorities. Jerom, Augustin, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Eusebius, and many others, all attest the same thing, and attest it in such a manner as shows that they knew it to be uncontroverted and judged it to be incontrovertible. ' But,' say some modern disputants, ' all the witnesses you ' can produce in support of this fact may, for aught we know, be reducible to one. ' Ireneus, perhaps, has had his information only from Papias; and Origen from ' Papias and Ireneus; and so of all the rest downwards, how numerous soever; so ' that the whole evidence may be, at bottom, no more than the testimony of Papias.' But, is the positive evidence of witnesses, delivered as of a well known fact, to be overturned by a mere supposition, *a perhaps*? for that the case was really as they suppose, no shadow of evidence is pretended. Papias is not quoted on this article by

(*m*) Αρξαμενος απο τω Ματθαιε ος και παραδεδοται πρωτος λοιπον τοις Εβραιοις εκδεδοκεναι το ευαγγελιον τοις εκ περιτομης πιστευουσιν. Comment. in Johan.

(*n*) Ματθαιος μεν γαρ τοις προσδεκωσι τον εξ Αβρααμ και Δαβιδ, Εβραιοις γραφων, Βιβλος, φησι, γενεσεως Ιησυ Χριστυ υιυ Δαβιδ, υιυ Αβρααμ.

(*o*) 2 Thess. ii. 15.

by Ireneus, nor is his name mentioned, or his teſtimony referred to. Nor is the teſtimony of either urged by Origen. As to Ireneus, from the early period in which he lived, he had advantages for information little inferior to thoſe of Papias, having been, in his younger years, well acquainted with Polycarp, the diſciple of the Apoſtle John. Had there then ſubſiſted any account or opinion, contradictory to the account given by Papias, Ireneus muſt certainly have known it, and would probably have mentioned it, either to confirm, or to confute, it. As the matter ſtands, we have here a perfect unanimity of the witneſſes, not a ſingle contradictory voice: no mention is there, either from thoſe fathers, or from any other ancient writer, that ever another account of this matter had been heard of in the church. Shall we then admit a mere modern hypotheſis, to overturn the foundations of all hiſtoric evidence?

§ 10. LET it be obſerved that Papias, in the words quoted from him, atteſted two things; that Matthew wrote the Goſpel aſcribed to him, and that he wrote it in Hebrew. Theſe two points reſt on the ſame bottom, and are equally, as matter of fact, the ſubjects of teſtimony As to both, the authority of Papias has been equally ſupported by ſucceeding authors, and by the concurrent voice of antiquity. Now there has not any thing been advanced to invalidate his teſtimony, in regard to the latter of theſe, that may not, with equal juſtice, be urged, to invalidate his teſtimony, in regard to the former This may be extended alſo to other points; for, that Mark was the writer of the Goſpel commonly aſcribed to him, reſts ultimately on the ſame authority. How arbitrary then is it, where the evidence is the ſame, and expoſed to the ſame objections, to admit the one without heſitation, and to reject the other? Wetſtein, for removing this difficulty, has ſuggeſted a diſtinction, inſinuating, that the former may be the teſtimony of Papias, the latter only his conjecture But if the words of Papias himſelf be attended to, no conjecture was ever worſe founded than this ſuggeſtion of Wetſtein. Papias ſpeaks of both in the ſame affirmative tone, as of matters of public notoriety.

I ſhall conclude the argument with obſerving, that the truth of the report, that he wrote in Hebrew, is the only plauſible account that can be given of the riſe of that report. Certain it is, that all the prejudices of the times, particularly among the Greek Chriſtians, were unfavourable to ſuch an opinion. Soon after the deſtruction of the temple of Jeruſalem, the Hebrew church, diſtinguiſhed by the name *Nazarene*, viſibly declined every day; the attachment which many of them ſtill retained to the ceremonies of the law, in like manner the errors of the Ebionites, and other diviſions which aroſe among them, made them ſoon be looked upon, by the Gentile churches, as but half-chriſtian at the moſt. That an advantage of this kind would have been ſo readily conceded to them by the Greeks, in oppoſition to all their own prejudices, can be attributed only to their full conviction of the fact.

§ 11. Dr. LARDNER's doubts (for I can diſcover none in Origin) are eaſily accounted for. Averſe, on one hand, to admit that there is any book of Scripture whereof

whereof we have only a tranſlation, and ſenſible of the danger of acquieſcing in an argument which would unſettle the whole foundations of his ſyſtem of credibility, he is inclinable to compromiſe the matter, by acknowledging both the Hebrew and the Greek to be originals, an opinion every way improbable, and ſo manifeſtly calculated to ſerve a turn, as cannot recommend it to a judicious and impartial critic. In this way of compounding matters, Whitby alſo, and ſome other diſputants on the ſame ſide, ſeem willing to terminate the difference. Nay, even Beauſobre and Lenfant, who have treated the queſtion at more length, and with greater warmth, than moſt others, conclude in this manner: "As there is no "diſpute affecting the foundation, that is, the authority of St. Matthew's Goſpel, "ſuch as we have it, the queſtion about the language ought to be regarded with "much indifference (*p*)."

§ 12. HAVING ſaid ſo much on the external evidence, I ſhall add but a few words, to ſhow, that the account of this matter, given by the earlieſt eccleſiaſtical writers, is not ſo deſtitute, as ſome may think, of internal probability. In every thing that concerned the introduction of the new diſpenſation, a particular attention was for ſome time ſhown, and the preference, before every other nation, given to the Jews. Our Lord's miniſtry upon the earth was among them only. In the miſſion of the Apoſtles, during his own life, they were expreſsly prohibited from going to the Gentiles, or ſo much as entering any city of the Samaritans (*q*); and when, after our Lord's reſurrection, the apoſtolical commiſſion was greatly enlarged, being extended to all nations throughout the world, ſtill a ſort of precedency was reſerved for God's ancient people. *It behoved the Meſſiah*, ſaid Jeſus (*r*), in his laſt inſtructions to the Apoſtles, *to ſuffer and to riſe from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached among all nations*, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM. The orders then given were punctually executed. The Apoſtles remained ſome time in Jeruſalem, preaching, and performing miracles in the name of the Lord Jeſus, with wonderful ſucceſs. Peter, in the concluſion of one of his diſcourſes, without flattering his countrymen, that this diſpenſation of grace would, like the law, be confined to their nation, takes notice of their prerogative, in having it firſt offered to their acceptance. TO YOU FIRST, ſays he (*s*), *God having raiſed up his ſon Jeſus, ſent him to bleſs you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* And even after the diſciples began to ſpread their maſter's doctrine through the neighbouring regions, we know, that till the illumination they received in the affair of Cornelius, which was ſeveral years after, they confined their teaching to their countrymen the Jews. And even after that memorable event, wherever the Apoſtles came, they appear firſt to have repaired to

4 the

(*p*) Ainſi n'y ayant point de diſpute ſur le fond de la choſe même, c'eſt-à-dire, ſur l'autorité de l'evangile de S. Matthieu, tel que nous l'avons, la queſtion de la langue doit être regardée avec beaucoup d'indifference. Preface ſur S Matthieu, iii. 5.

(*q*) Matth. x. 5.

(*r*) Luke, xxiv. 46, 47.

(*s*) Acts, xiii. 46.

the ſynagogue, if there was a ſynagogue in the place, and to have addreſſed themſelves to thoſe of the circumciſion, and afterwards to the Gentiles. What Paul and Barnabas ſaid, to their Jewiſh brethren at Antioch (*t*), ſets this matter in the ſtrongeſt light. *It was* NECESSARY *that the word of God ſhould* FIRST HAVE BEEN SPOKEN TO YOU: *but ſeeing ye put it from you, and judge yourſelves unworthy of everlaſting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.* Have we not then reaſon to conclude, from the expreſs order, as well as from the example, of our Lord, and from the uniform practice of his diſciples, that it was ſuitable to the will of Providence, in this diſpenſation of grace, that every advantage ſhould be firſt offered to the Jews, eſpecially the inhabitants of Jeruſalem; and that the Goſpel, which had been firſt delivered to them by word, both by our Lord himſelf, and by his apoſtles, ſhould be alſo firſt preſented to them in writing, in that very dialect in which many of the readers, at the time of the publication, might remember to have heard the ſame ſacred truths, as they came from the mouth of Him who ſpake as never man ſpake, the great oracle of the Father, the interpreter of God?

§ 13. IF the merciful diſpenſation was in effect ſoon fruſtrated by their defection; this is but of a piece with what happened in regard to all the other advantages they enjoyed. The ſacred depoſit was firſt corrupted among them, and afterwards it diſappeared: for that the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, uſed by the Nazarenes (to which, as the original, Jerom ſometimes had recourſe (*u*), and which, he tells us, he had tranſlated into Greek and Latin), and that the Goſpel alſo uſed by the Ebionites, were, though greatly vitiated and interpolated, the remains of Matthew's original, will, notwithſtanding the objections of Mill and others, hardly bear a reaſonable doubt. Their loſs of this Goſpel proved the prelude to the extinction of that church. But we have reaſon to be thankful that what was moſt valuable in the work, is not loſt to the Chriſtian community. The verſion we have in Greek is written with much evangelical ſimplicity, entirely in the idiom and manner of the Apoſtles. And I freely acknowledge, that if the Hebrew Goſpel were ſtill extant, ſuch as it was in the days of Jerom, or even of Origen, we ſhould have much more reaſon to confide in the authenticity of the common Greek tranſlation, than in that of an original wherewith ſuch unbounded freedoms had been taken. The paſſages quoted by the ancients from the Goſpel according to the Hebrews, which are not to be found in the Goſpel according to Matthew, bear intrinſic marks, the moſt unequivocal, of the baſeneſs of their origin.

§ 14. IT may be proper here to enquire a little more particularly what language it was that the ancient eccleſiaſtical writers meant by Hebrew, when they ſpoke of the original of this Goſpel. I ſhould have ſcarcely thought this enquiry neceſſary, had I not obſerved that this matter has been more miſunderſtood, even by authors of ſome eminence, than I could have imagined. Beauſobre and Lenfant in

(*t*) Acts, xiii. 46. (*u*) Hier. Com. in Mat. lib. i. cap. 16. Matth. vi. 11. N.

particular, go ſo far as to argue againſt the probability of the fact, becauſe, what we commonly call Hebrew, the language of the Old Teſtament, was not then ſpoken either in Paleſtine, or any where elſe, being underſtood only by the learned. And that the common language of the country was not meant, they conclude, from the uſe which Euſebius, who calls the original of Matthew's Goſpel Hebrew, makes of the word Syriac, when he ſays of Bardaſenes, that he was eloquent in the Syrian language. 'Thus,' ſay they, 'he knew how to diſtinguiſh between Hebrew and 'the language of the country, which he calls Syriac.' But in this theſe critics themſelves have unluckily fallen into a miſtake, in ſuppoſing that Syriac was, in the time of our Lord and his Apoſtles, or, during the ſubſiſtence of the Jewiſh polity, the language of Paleſtine. That their language at that time had a mixture of the Syrian language, is acknowledged; but not that it was the ſame. It was what Jerom very aptly calls Syro-chaldaic, having an affinity to both languages, but much more to the Chaldean than to the Syrian. It was, in ſhort, the language which the Jews brought with them from Babylon after the captivity, blended with that of the people whom they found, at their return, in the land, and in the neighbouring regions. It is this which is invariably called Hebrew in the New Teſtament, I might have ſaid in Scripture, no language whatever being ſo named in the Old Teſtament. It is denominated Hebrew, as Lightfoot has, from ſome rabbinical writings, with great probability, ſuggeſted (*x*), becauſe the language of thoſe who returned from captivity, would readily be called, by thoſe who poſſeſſed the land, *lingua tranſfluviana*, or *tranſeuphratenſis*, the language of the people beyond the Euphrates, the river which they had paſſed in returning to their own country; and the name, as often happens, would be retained, when the language was much altered.

§ 15. ABRAM was in Canaan called *the Hebrew* (*y*), for this reaſon, probably, becauſe he was from the farther ſide of the great river, not becauſe he was deſcended from Heber, one indeed in the line of his progenitors, but one of whom nothing remarkable is mentioned to diſtinguiſh him from the reſt. Heber was neither the firſt after the ſons of Noah, nor the immediate father of the Patriarch. Accordingly the word is, in that paſſage where Abram is ſo named, which is the firſt time it occurs, rendered by the Seventy ὁ περατης *tranſitor*. The Canaanites, amongſt whom he ſojourned, appear to have uſed the name *Hebrew* in a manner ſimilar to that wherein the Italians uſe the word *tramontani* for all who live north of the Alps. The peculiarity, in reſpect both of religion and of cuſtoms, which continued in Abram's poſterity, in the line of Jacob, and prevented them from mingling with other nations, or adopting their manners, muſt have been the reaſon why this appellation was given to the deſcendants in continuance, which, in ſtrictneſs, was applicable to the firſt comers only. But let it be obſerved, that though this term was very early uſed of the nation, it was not applied to the language brought by Abram and

(*x*) Hor. Heb. Jo. v. 2. (*y*) Gen. xiv. 13.

and his family from Ur of the Chaldees, a language which they ſoon loſt, acquiring in its ſtead that of the Canaanites, amongſt whom they lived. Abram's tongue was, doubtleſs, Chaldee, that of the country whence he came. But we learn from the ſacred hiſtorian, that Jacob his grandſon (though he could not fail to underſtand that language, having lived ſo long with Laban) ſpoke at home a different tongue. *Laban called* the heap which they had raiſed *Jegar-ſahadutha: but Jacob called it Galeed* (*z*). Both names ſignify the ſame thing, *the heap of teſtimony*, the former being Chaldee, the latter what is now always called *Hebrew*, but then *the language of Canaan*.

I have obſerved already, that the language of the Old Teſtament which we now always call Hebrew, is never ſo called in Scripture, neither in the Old Teſtament nor in the New. This is a ſtrong preſumption that it was not anciently ſo named by any body, and that if any language had been in the Old Teſtament named Hebrew, it would have been the Chaldee, agreeably to the etymology of the word Hebrew, the language of thoſe who lived beyond the Euphrates. This, however, might be accounted no more than a preſumption, perhaps but a plauſible conjecture, if the language of the Iſraelites were not repeatedly mentioned in the Old Teſtament by other names. It is commonly called there *the Jews language* (*a*), and in one place *the language of Canaan* (*b*). That in after-times the ancient Jewiſh tongue, which was often named the holy language, was alſo called *Hebrew*, is not denied. Joſephus, in particular, names it ſo (*c*), in relating the meſſage of Rabſhakeh from the king of Aſſyria to king Hezekiah above referred to, as he uſes the word Εβραϊστι, in *Hebrew*, where the ſacred hiſtorian had ſaid יהודית *Jehudith*, and the Seventy Ιουδαϊστι, *in the Jews language*. But this is long poſterior to the finiſhing of the canon of the Old Teſtament; for Joſephus did not write till after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, towards the end of the firſt Chriſtian century. In the prologue to the Book of Eccleſiaſticus, the term Εβραϊστι is likewiſe uſed, but it is not certain in what acceptation. By the account given there, that book was tranſlated into Greek in the time of Ptolemy Evergetes king of Egypt, by Jeſus, who was the ſon of Sirach, and the grandſon of Jeſus the author. As the original, therefore, muſt have been written long after the captivity, it is more probable that it was compoſed in the dialect ſpoken in Paleſtine at the time, than that it was written in a dead language, underſtood only by the learned, and conſequently that the word occurs in that prologue in the ſame acceptation wherein it is always uſed in the New Teſtament. It has, in my judgment, been proved beyond contradiction by the learned, particularly Bochart (*d*), Walton (*e*), and Le Clerc (*f*), that the language of the Old Teſtament is no other than the native tongue of the Canaanites, which in Greek writers is called Phenician, and did not materially differ from the dialect of the Tyrians, Sidonians,

(*z*) Gen. xxxi. 47.
(*a*) 2 Kings, xviii. 26. 28. 2 Chron. xxxii. 18. Neh. xiii. 24. Iſa. xxxvi. 11. 13.
(*b*) Iſa. xix. 18.
(*c*) Antiq. lib. x. cap. 1.
(*d*) Canaan, l. ii. c. 1.
(*e*) Prolegomena, iii. 13, &c.
(*f*) Prolegomena, in Pentateuch. Diſſ. I. V.

Sidonians, and Carthaginians. *Canaan* is rendered by the Seventy (*g*) φοινικη *Phenicia* A *Canaanitiſh* woman φοινισσα (*h*), a *Phenician* woman, and the land of Canaan is called η χωρα των φοινικων (*i*), *the country of the Phenicians*. And even in the New Teſtament we have a plain proof that the names were uſed promiſcuouſly, inaſmuch as the perſon who is called by one Evangeliſt a woman of Canaan (*k*), is denominated by another Evangeliſt a Syrophenician (*l*).

§ 16. AT the ſame time it ought to be remarked that the language of Chaldea, which, before the captivity, ſeems never to have been denominated Hebrew, was always by the Jews diſtinguiſhed by ſome other name. The moſt common was that which in the Engliſh tranſlation, after the Septuagint and the Vulgate, is rendered *Syrian*, but is in the original ארמית *Aramith*. It is ſo called in ſome of the places above quoted, and in like manner by Ezra (*m*). The Oriental name *Aram*, though commonly rendered *Syria*, does not exactly correſpond in meaning to this word, at leaſt in the uſe made of it in latter times. The boundary of Syria on the Eaſt, when the name came to be uſed in a more confined manner, was the river Euphrates; whereas Aram comprehended large tracts of country beyond the river, as Meſopotamia, Chaldea, Aſſyria. Syria was included, but it made only a part. Now the Jewiſh language was ſo different from this, that it is manifeſt the common people anciently in Judea underſtood nothing of *Aramic* or Chaldee. For a proof of this we need recur only to ſome of the places above referred to (*n*). Further, it is of the ſame people the Chaldeans, that the prophet ſpeaks in this prediction (*o*): *Lo, I will bring a nation upon you from afar, O houſe of Iſrael, ſaith the Lord; it is a mighty nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whoſe language thou knoweſt not, neither underſtandeſt what they ſay.*

§ 17. But it may be ſaid, ſince the name *Aram* included the country commonly called Syria, and was equally applicable to it as to any other part, and ſince the word *Aramith* was employed to denote the language of the whole; the Syrian and the Chaldean muſt have been one and the ſame language. That they were ſo originally, I am fully convinced. In proceſs of time, however, from the different fates to which the eaſtern parts and the weſtern of that once great empire were ſubjected, there gradually ſprang up a conſiderable difference between them, inſomuch that in latter times they may not unfitly be denominated different languages, though ſtill they have more affinity to each other than any other of the two Oriental tongues. The ſame language is called alſo very properly (*p*), *the tongue of the Chaldeans*. Now as the Jews, when they returned from captivity, brought a dialect of this language with them into their own country, it ſuited their national pride to adopt ſuch a general name as Hebrew, which though it may ſignify, when explained from etymology, the language ſpoken beyond the river, would be generally underſtood

(*g*) Exod. xvi. 35.
(*h*) Exod. vi. 15.
(*i*) Joſh. v. 12.
(*k*) Matth. xv. 22.
(*l*) Mark, vii. 24.
(*m*) Ezra, iv. 7.
(*n*) 2 Kings, xviii. 26. Iſa. xxxvi. 11.
(*o*) Jer. v. 15.
(*p*) Dan. i. 4.

underſtood to denote the language of the people called Hebrews, a name by which their nation had been diſtinguiſhed from the beginning. This appellation, therefore, muſt appear more eligible to them, than any name which would ſerve more directly to remind themſelves and others, that they had lived ſo long in ſubjection to another people; a diſagreeable effect, which could not fail to reſult from their calling the language they had adopted Chaldee, Babylonian, or even the language of Aram. Beſides, to have called it ſo, would have counfounded it with a language conſiderably different.

§ 18. We have no reaſon to conſider the dialect which the Jews introduced into Judea, on their return from the Babyloniſh captivity, as entirely pure. But in whatever ſtate it might have been at firſt, it cannot be imagined that its purity could have been preſerved five hundred years, eſpecially conſidering the great variety of calamities, as well as the different ſpecies of tyranny which the nation experienced in that interval. The language of the neighbours, and of thoſe who, from the circumjacent countries, had, during the people's abſence, poſſeſſed the land, which was chiefly Syriac, would have a conſiderable ſhare in the ordinary ſpeech. With theſe we might expect to find a mixture of Greek and Latin words, as Judea had been ſucceſſively ſubjected to the Macedonians and the Romans. Exactly ſuch it is found to have been in the time of our Saviour. What, therefore, is called Hebrew in the New Teſtament, and by the earlieſt fathers, is not the language of the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, ſpoken by the Jews in Paleſtine before the captivity; it is not the Chaldee ſpoken in Babylon; neither is it the Syriac ſpoken in the neighbouring country of Syria; but it is a dialect formed of all the three languages, chiefly the two laſt blended together, and which is therefore properly denominated Syro-Chaldaic, as having a great affinity to both, and, at the ſame time, retaining much of the old Hebrew idiom.—After the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, the extinction of the Jewiſh polity, and the diſperſion of the people by the Romans, their particular dialect fell quickly into diſuſe; and Syriac, the language of the province (for to Syria Paleſtine had before now been annexed), became ſoon the prevailing language of the whole country. This will perhaps in part account for the undoubted fact, that a correct copy of Matthew's original was in a ſhort time no where to be found. The very dialect ſhared in the fate of the people, and did not long ſurvive their city and temple.

§ 19. Further, that the language of the Syriac verſion of the New Teſtament (though juſtly accounted much nearer to the language uſed by our Lord and his Apoſtles than that of any other verſion now extant) is not properly the ſame language, may be proved from that very tranſlation itſelf; where we ſometimes, not al ays, find a difference between the words which the ſacred writers have retained in their original form, and thoſe employed by the Syriac interpreter. In ſome caſes, I admit, they are the ſame. Thus the Evangeliſt Mark has given, in his Goſpel (*q*), the

(*q*) ch. v. 41.

the original expreſſion, *Talitha cumi*, uſed by our Lord, adding the interpretation into Greek. The Syriac tranſlator employs alſo the original expreſſion, but adds no interpretation, finding that it ſuits equally the Syrian language, as that which in the New Teſtament is called Hebrew. Nay, the ſame expreſſion is uſed, in another Goſpel, in the Syriac (*r*), where the evangeliſt does not, as Mark, introduce the original words. Alſo many words, as *rabbi* and *abba*, are the ſame in both. This may likewiſe be ſaid of ſome proper names, which have the ſignification of appellatives. *Cephas* being of the ſame import in both languages, needed not an interpretation in Syriac as in Greek (*s*). On the name *Thomas* there was an inconſiderable difference. What was *Thaoma* in the dialect of Jeruſalem, was, in proper Syrian, *Thama*. This interpretation is thrice given in the Syriac verſion of John's Goſpel (*t*), as anſwering to the Greek Δίδυμος, *twin*. . Boanerges (*u*), Aceldama (*x*), and Golgotha (*y*), are all tranſlated by that interpreter, who would not have made this diſtinction, with regard to them, if he had thought them equally intelligible, to Syrian readers, with the terms whereof he has given no explanation. As to the change made by that interpreter on the cry, *Eli, eli*, uttered by our Lord on the croſs, I muſt refer the reader to the notes on the paſſages (*z*) where it is mentioned. On the the name *Siloam* (*a*), a ſmall alteration is made; and no interpretation is added, in the Greek, becauſe the word, ſo altered, conveys the ſame meaning in Syriac, which *Siloam* did in the dialect of Jeruſalem, and conſequently needs no interpretation. All theſe obſervations ſerve to ſhow both the affinity of the two languages, and their difference. The difference, in my judgment, was enough to render one of them unintelligible to thoſe who were accuſtomed only to the other; and the affinity was ſo great, as to render a very little practice ſufficient to qualify thoſe who ſpoke the one, for underſtanding the other. Whether the ſame may not be ſaid of ſome northern European tongues, as German, Dutch, Daniſh, and Swediſh, or even of thoſe of the ſouthern regions, as French, Italian, Portugueze, and Spaniſh, I leave to thoſe, who are beſt acquainted with theſe languages, to determine.

§ 20. I SHALL add only one remark more for evincing the difference between the language called *Hebrew* in the New Teſtament, and the Syriac: it is this, that the name always given to Syria, in the Syriac verſion, is not Aram, as in the Old Teſtament, but סוריא *Suria;* whence, according to analogy, the name appropriated to the language is סוריאית *Suriaith* (*b*); whereas Ἑβραϊστί, in the Greek New Teſtament, or τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, is never rendered *Suriaith*, but *Ghibraith*. See the paſſages quoted in the margin (*c*); in ſome of which, we have both the name itſelf, in what is called *Hebrew*, the language of the place, and, for the ſake of the Syriac reader, an interpretation

(*r*) Luke, viii. 54.
(*s*) John, i. 42.
(*t*) ch. xi. 16. xx. 24. xxi. 2.
(*u*) Mark, iii. 17.
(*x*) Acts, i. 19.
(*y*) Matth. xxvii. 33.
(*z*) Matth. xxvii. 46. Mark, xv. 34.
(*a*) John, ix. 7.
(*b*) Shaffii Lexicon Syriac. N. T. edition, 2da prætermiſſa.
(*c*) Luke, xxiii. 38. John, v. 2. xix. 13. 17. 20. Acts, xxi. 40. xxii. 2. xxvi. 14. Rev. ix. 11. xvi. 16.

pretation of the name into that tongue. This ſhows evidently, that the Hebrew word had no currency with them, as it needed an explanation. Nay, more, in the poſtſcript ſubjoined to the Syriac verſion of this Goſpel, the language in which Matthew wrote and preached, is not termed *Suriaith*, but *Ghibraith* (*d*). Let it be obſerved, that I urge this, not as a teſtimony of the fact (as a teſtimony it is not needed, and would be of of very little conſequence), but ſolely to mark the diſtinction obſerved in the application of the words Syriac and Hebrew. But enough, for ſhowing that the language called *Hebrew* by the writers of the New Teſtament, is not the ſame with the language of the Old Teſtament, which is never in Scripture called *Hebrew;* that it is neither pure *Syriac* nor *Chaldee*, but that it approaches neareſt the laſt of theſe, though with a conſiderable mixture of the other two. An attention to theſe things will ſerve to ſhow, how ill-founded many things are, which have been advanced on this ſubject, by Beauſobre and others.

§ 21. WHEN men's opinions favour their known prejudices, this circumſtance is a conſiderable abatement from the authority of ſuch opinions; and even when their teſtimony favours their prejudices, there is ſtill ground for abatement, though in a leſs degree; men not being ſo eaſily miſled in matters of teſtimony as in matters of opinion. The contrary holds, when either the opinion, or the teſtimony given, is unfavourable to the prejudices of the perſon who gives it. Such, doubtleſs, was the caſe of the ancient Gentile Chriſtians, when they gave a teſtimony which in any reſpect favoured the pretenſions of the Nazarenes. Their teſtimony is itſelf at leaſt a ſtrong preſumption of their impartiality, and of the juſtice of a rival claim. The reverſe is the natural preſumption in regard to the opinion of a modern diſputant, when that opinion ſerves manifeſtly to ſupport a favourite tenet, controverted by an adverſe ſect. This conſideration will be found greatly to diminiſh the weight, if it can be ſaid to have any weight, of what has been advanced on this head, in latter ages, againſt the uniform ſuffrage of antiquity.

§ 22. THAT this Goſpel was compoſed by one born a Jew, familiarly acquainted with the opinions, ceremonies, and cuſtoms, of his countrymen; that it was compoſed by one converſant in the ſacred writings, and habituated to their idiom; a man of plain ſenſe, but of little or no learning, except what he derived from the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; and, finally, that it was the production of a man who wrote ſeriouſly, and from conviction; who, as on moſt occaſions he had been preſent, had attended cloſely to the facts and ſpeeches which he related; but who, in writing, entertained not the moſt diſtant view of ſetting off himſelf by the relation; we have as ſtrong internal evidence as the nature of the thing will admit; and much ſtronger than that wherein the mind, in ninety-nine caſes out of a hundred, acquieſces. Now, exactly ſuch a man the Apoſtle and Evangeliſt Matthew muſt have been; of whom, as

(*d*) The poſtſcript, literally tranſlated, is, "Here endeth the holy Goſpel of Matthew's preaching, "which he preached in Hebrew, in the land of Paleſtine."

as we have ſeen, we have an hiſtorical proof, quite unexceptioable, that he was the author.

§ 23. THAT this hiſtory was primarily intended for the uſe of his countrymen the Jews, we have, in aid of hiſtorical evidence, very ſtrong preſumptions, from the tenor of the book itſelf. Every circumſtance is carefully pointed out, which might conciliate the faith of that nation; every unneceſſary expreſſion is avoided, which might in any way ſerve to obſtruct it. To come to particulars: there was no ſentiment relating to the Meſſiah, with which the Jews were more ſtrongly poſſeſſed, than that he muſt be of the race of Abram, and of the family of David; Matthew, therefore, with great propriety, begins his narrative with the genealogy of Jeſus. That he ſhould be born at Bethlehem, in Judea, is another circumſtance, in which the learned among the Jews of thoſe times were univerſally agreed. His birth in that city, with ſome very memorable circumſtances that attended it, this hiſtorian has alſo taken the firſt opportunity to mention. Thoſe paſſages in the Prophets, or other ſacred books, which either foretell any thing that ſhould happen to him, or admit an alluſive application, or were in that age generally underſtood to be applicable to events which concern the Meſſiah, are never paſſed over in ſilence by this Evangeliſt. The fulfilment of prophecy was always to the Jews, convinced of the inſpiration of their ſacred writings, a principal topic of argument. Accordingly, none of the Evangeliſts has been more careful than Matthew, that nothing of this kind ſhould be overlooked. And though the quality I am going to mention, is not always to be diſcovered in modern tranſlations, none of the ſacred penmen has more properly avoided the unneceſſary introduction of any term offenſive to his countrymen (*e*).

§ 24. THAT we find ſo much of this kind in the Greek, has been urged by ſome, as an argument, that it is the original of this Goſpel, though, in fact, it proves no more, than that it is either the original, or a cloſe tranſlation; for other acknowledged verſions can be produced, in which this circumſtance is equally obſervable. In regard to this, I frankly own that the Greek, in my judgment, has not many of thoſe peculiarities which may be called marks of tranſlation. That which might chiefly appear ſuch to a critic, is no other than what might naturally be expected in a Jewiſh original on the ſubject of religion, written in that age and country. The quality I allude to, is the frequent recurrence of the Oriental idiom, in which Matthew, I believe, will not be found to abound more than the other Evangeliſts, Mark, Luke, and John, who, by the acknowledgment of all parties, wrote in Greek. Some other arguments of this kind, as, that the quotations from the Old Teſtament are generally in the words of the Septuagint, that the words uſed on certain occaſions, by our Lord, are retained and explained, are fully anſwered by Simon (*f*), to whom, that I may not prove tedious, I muſt refer the reader.

(*e*) Ch. i. 11. N. T.

(*f*) Hiſt. Crit. du. Texte du N. ch. v, &c.

§ 25. THERE is, however, one argument from the language, and but one, that has occurred to my obſervation, which forms, at leaſt, a preſumption that the Greek is a verſion. Though the ſacred writers, in that language, ſometimes retain in their narratives, without adding an explanation, a memorable Oriental word in frequent uſe among the people, and known to all connected with them, ſuch as *Hoſanna*, *Hallelujah*; we never find, in the moral or didactic part, any thing introduced from a different tongue, which renders the import of a precept unintelligible to thoſe unacquainted with the tongue. Indeed, in the hiſtory, the very words ſpoken (to impreſs thoſe more ſtrongly who happen to underſtand them) are, though ſeldom, ſometimes mentioned, but they are always accompanied with an interpretation, that no reader may be at a loſs for the meaning. Such are *Ephphatha*, *Talitha cumi*, and the exclamation on the croſs. But the prohibition of what is criminal, and that under a ſevere ſanction, where the crime itſelf is expreſſed in an unknown tongue, and left unexplained, is totally without a parallel in holy writ. Of this we have an example in the words thus rendered in the common verſion (*g*); *Whoſoever ſhall ſay to his brother* RACA, *ſhall be in danger of the council: but whoſoever ſhall ſay*, THOU FOOL, *ſhall be in danger of hell fire*. I think with Dr. Sykes, that μωρε, in this place ought to be underſtood as an Oriental, and not a Greek word, as well as ρακα; for מרה *moreh*, is actually ſuch a word, and could not be repreſented otherwiſe in the Greek character. The Engliſh tranſlators, therefore, had the ſame reaſon for rendering the latter clauſe, *Whoſoever ſhall ſay Moreh*, that they had for rendering the former clauſe, *Whoſoever ſhall ſay Raca*. It is, at leaſt, preſumable, that the ſame caution which led the writer to preſerve the original term in one member of this ſentence, would lead him alſo to preſerve it in the other, more eſpecially as this is the clauſe which contains the ſevereſt threatening.

Beſides, our finding that this word is a term of reproach in that dialect, as well as the other, adds greatly to the probability, that it was ſo underſtood by the writer. Moreover, if this be interpreted as a Greek word, and rendered *thou fool*, it will coincide with *raca*, ſtultus, fatuus, which can hardly be rendered otherwiſe; whereas, there is evidently intended here, a gradation in the crimes, as there is a gradation in the puniſhments. Now, let it be obſerved, that this manner, in ſuch a caſe as the preſent, ſuits more the exceſſive ſcrupuloſity of a tranſlator, than the ſimplicity and plainneſs of an inſpired writer, who means to inſtruct his readers in every duty, and to warn them againſt every danger. Did the ſacred penmen find it neceſſary to employ Syro-Chaldaic terms, becauſe thoſe reproachful names had nothing equivalent to them in the Greek language, and conſequently, becauſe thoſe who ſpoke Greek, not being ſuſceptible of the guilt implied in uſing thoſe words, were in no danger of incurring the puniſhment? This is too abſurd to be believed by any body. There is no language, ancient or modern, in which abuſe may not be uttered; and indignation, contempt, and abhorrence, ſignified in the higheſt degree. In ſuch a caſe, therefore, it would be unaccountable and unparalleled in an inſpired author to adopt

(*g*) Matth. v. 22.

terms unintelligible to the people whoſe language he writes, and leave them unexplained; but this manner is not at all to be wondered at in a tranſlator, eſpecially when we conſider how apt the early tranſlators among the Jews were to carry their ſcruples this way to exceſs. I had occaſion to obſerve before (*b*), that one of the greateſt difficulties in tranſlating, is to find words in one language, that ſufficiently correſpond to thoſe of another, which relate to manners and ſentiments. In moſt other matters there is, comparatively, but little difficulty. The word *moreh*, here uſed by the Evangeliſt, differs only in number from *morim*, the compellation with which Moſes and Aaron addreſſed the people of Iſrael, when they ſaid (*i*), with manifeſt and indecent paſſion, as rendered in the Engliſh Bible, *Hear, now*, YE REBELS, and were, for their puniſhment, not permitted to enter the Land of Canaan. The word, however, as it is oftner uſed to imply rebellion againſt God than againſt any earthly ſovereign; and as it includes diſbelief of his word, as well as diſobedience to his command, I think better rendered in this place *miſcreant*, which is alſo, like the original term, expreſſive of the greateſt abhorrence and deteſtation. In this way tranſlated, the gradation of crimes, as well as of puniſhments, is preſerved, and the impropriety avoided, of delivering a moral precept, of conſequence to men of all denominations, in words intelligible only to the learned.

§ 26. As the ſacred writers, eſpecially the Evangeliſts, have many qualities in common, ſo there is ſomething in every one of them, which, if attended to, will be found to diſtinguiſh him from the reſt. That which principally diſtinguiſhes Matthew, is the diſtinctneſs and particularity with which he has related many of our Lord's diſcourſes and moral inſtructions. Of theſe his ſermon on the mount, his charge to the Apoſtles, his illuſtrations of the nature of his kingdom, and his prophecy on mount Olivet, are examples. He has alſo wonderfully united ſimplicity and energy in relating the replies of his Maſter to the cavils of his adverſaries. Being early called to the apoſtleſhip, he was an eye and ear witneſs of moſt of the things which he relates. And though I do not think it was the ſcope of any of theſe hiſtorians, to adjuſt their narratives by the preciſe order of time wherein the events happened; there are ſome circumſtances which incline me to think, that Matthew has approached at leaſt as near that order as any of them. They do not call their works *hiſtories*; and as to the import of the title ευαγγελιον commonly given, it is, in this application, well explained by Juſtin Martyr, a writer of the ſecond century, who makes it equivalent to απομνημονευματα, *memorable things*, or *memoirs*, according to the explanation of this word given by Johnſon, which he defines, *An account of tranſactions familiarly written.*

§ 27. IT has been ſhown, that we have reaſon to conſider Matthew's Greek Goſpel, which we at preſent poſſeſs, as a verſion from the original, written in the language ſpoken in Paleſtine in our Lord's time, and during the ſubſiſtence of the Jewiſh

(*b*) Diſſ. II. Part. I § 4. (*i*) Numb. xx. 10.

Jewiſh commonwealth. But as to the tranſlator, nothing but conjecture has ever been advanced by the learned. The obſcurity in which the queſtion about the tranſlator lies, can no wiſe affect the credibility of the fact, that it is a tranſlation. Who ever doubted that the Syriac New Teſtament, and the old Italic, are tranſlations? Yet the tranſlators are equally unknown with the Greek interpreter of Matthew's Hebrew Goſpel. This is oftenеſt the caſe with ancient verſions; and we have reaſon to believe that the preſent is very ancient, it having been made before thoſe freedoms were taken with the original, which have juſtly brought diſhonour on the Nazarene and the Ebionite copies.

§ 28. THAT Matthew's Goſpel was the firſt publiſhed, is another opinion, as was hinted already, which reſts on the concurrent voice of antiquity, the ſame foundation with that on which our belief is built that Matthew was the author, and that the language in which he wrote his Goſpel, was that kind of Hebrew which was ſpoken at that time in Judea. Notice was taken of Matthew's Goſpel, and of Mark's, very early in the church, and before we find any direct mention of Luke's and of John's. The firſt who expreſsly mentions all the four Evangeliſts, is Ireneus, who mentions them as having written in the ſame order wherein they appear to have been arranged in the Bible in his time, and wherein they have continued ever ſince. Some tranſcribers have, indeed, affected to arrange them differently, putting the two Apoſtles before the other two, who were only Evangeliſts. But they ſeem to have done this, from an opinion of the comparative rank of the writers, without controverting the order in which the Goſpels were written. In the Cambridge manuſcript, which is followed by ſome other manuſcripts leſs conſiderable, the order is, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But Matthew's title to the firſt place does not appear, in any view of the matter, ever to have been queſtioned among the ancients. Some, of late, have thought themſelves warranted to aſſign the propriety in point of time to the Evangeliſt Luke. Their reaſons for this opinion I ſhall conſider in the preface to that Goſpel.

CONTENTS.

MATTHEW's GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

The Nativity.

CH. I. II.

THE lineage of Jesus from Abraham:—his conception and birth:—the visit of the magians:—the judgment of the chief priests and scribes concerning the place where the Messiah should be born:—Joseph's retreat into Egypt:—the murder of the infants:—Herod's death:—Joseph's return to Galilee.
Page 285

SECTION II.

The Baptism.

CH. III. IV.

John sent to baptize and announce the Messiah:—Jesus baptized by him, and attested from heaven:—tempted by the devil in the desert:—returns to Galilee:—calls Peter, Andrew, and the two sons of Zebedee:—gives intimation to the people of the reign of God:—performs miraculous cures. 287

SECTION III.

The Sermon on the Mount.

CH. V. VI. VII.

Who are y:—the disciples of Jesus bound to be exemplary:—he came to ratify the divine law, much impaired ne traditions of the Pharisees:—I. in respect to extent:—this exemplified in what concerns: 1. murder, 2. adultery, 3 divorce, 4. oaths, 5. retaliation, 6. the love of our neighbour:—II. in respect of motive;—where the end is applause, the virtue is destroyed:—this exemplified, 1. in almsgiving, 2. in prayer, 3. in fasting.—Did we estimate the stability of the things in heaven compared with the things on earth, we should pursue the former with ardour, and prove superior to all anxiety about the latter:—the service of Mammon incompatible with the service of God:—admonitions to charitableness in judging others;—to impartiality in judging ourselves;—to discretion in dispensing religious benefits;—to assiduity in pursuing spiritual good;—to humanity and equity in our behaviour to all:—caution against the seducing influence of the multitude commonly in the wrong:—warning against false teachers, who are best known by their actions:—the wisdom of adding practice to knowledge:—the insignificancy of the latter without the former. 289

SECTION IV.

Several Miracles.

CH. VIII. IX. 1—34.

The cure of a leper;—of a centurion's servant;—of Peter's wife's mother;—of some demoniacs and others;—those who follow Jesus must do it at all hazards, and without delay:—the stilling of a tempest on the sea:
—the

—the cure of two furious demoniacs;—of a paralytic carried on a bed: Matthew called:—the reaſon why Jeſus aſſociated with ſinners;—why his diſciples did not faſt:—a woman cured of a bloody iſſue;—a ruler's daughter reſtored to life:—the cure of two blind men, and of a dumb demoniac. *Page* 295

SECTION V.

The Charge to the Apostles.

CH. IX. 35, &c. X. XI. 1.

Jeſus ſelects twelve whom he names apoſtles:—commiſſions them to announce the reign of heaven to his countrymen the Jews, empowering them to perform miraculous cures:—to ſecure them againſt ſolicitude, he aſſures them of the care of Providence, and of the illuminations of the Spirit:—he warns them by his own example of what they may expect from men, againſt the dread of whom he fortifies them by the conſideration of the omnipotence of God:—his cauſe will occaſion diviſions in families:—by all genuine diſciples he will be preferred to every other object:—the ſmalleſt ſervices performed from love to him, ſhall not be unrewarded. 298

SECTION VI.

The Character of the Times.

CH. XI. 2, &c. XII.

John's meſſage to Jeſus:—the teſtimony of Jeſus concerning John:—the people's opinion of both:—the aggravated guilt of Chorazin, Bethſaida, and Capernaum, who had enjoyed the miniſtry of Jeſus and ſeen his miracles, yet remained impenitent:—the wiſdom of God in adapting his new diſpenſation to the ſimple and unlearned, who are invited by Jeſus to come under his guidance:—the doctrine of the Phariſees concerning the Sabbath confuted, 1. from Scripture, 2. from reaſon, 3. from their own practice:—the manner wherein they account for his expelling demons expoſed:—the danger of detracting from the Holy Spirit:—miracles not intended for gratifying curioſity or captiouſneſs:—the obduracy and folly of the age ſtrongly condemned by the repentance of the Ninevites, and the zeal for wiſdom manifeſted by the queen of Sheba:—the miſimprovement of benefits begets inſenſibility:—who are conſidered by Jeſus as his neareſt relatives. 300

SECTION VII.

Parables.

CH. XIII. 1—53.

The parable of the ſower:—the reaſon why Jeſus taught in parables:—the explanation of the parable:—the parable of the darnel;—of the grain of muſtard ſeed;—of the leaven:—the explanation of the parable of the darnel;—the parable of the hidden treaſure;—of the precious pearl;—of the ſweep net, with its explanation. 304

SECTION VIII.

The People twice fed in the Desert.

CH. XIII. 54, &c. XIV. XV. XVI. 1—12.

Jeſus deſpiſed by his fellow-citizens on account of his parentage;—is informed how John the Baptiſt was killed by Herod;—retires to a deſert;—is followed by more than 5000 perſons whom he there feeds miraculouſly;—makes his diſciples embark for the other ſide of the lake;—follows them in the night, walking on the water;—entering the bark, ſtills the ſtorm;—many, in the country of Genneſaret, cured by touching his garment;—his diſciples vindicated from the charge brought by the Phariſees, who, by their traditions, annulled the law of God:—moral pollution proceeds only from vice:—a demon expelled from the daughter of a woman who, though a Gentile, ſhowed extraordinary faith:—in a mountain, near the ſea of Galilee, many cures performed, and upwards of 4000 miraculouſly fed:—a ſign, ſuch as they demanded, refuſed to both Phariſees and Sadducees:—the diſciples cautioned againſt their doctrine under the name of leaven, which they, interpreting literally, miſunderſtood. 306

SEC-

SECTION IX.

The Transfiguration.

CH. XVI. 13, &c. XVII. XVIII.

The opinions of the people concerning Jeſus:—Peter avows him to be the Meſſiah:—Jeſus aſſerts the perpetuity of his church ſoon to be erected;—foretells his own death;—rebukes Peter, who was ſcandalized at hearing it mentioned:—all who would be followers warned to prepare for ſufferings and death:—Jeſus transfigured in the preſence of Peter, James, and John:—lets them know who the Elijah was that ſhould come firſt:—aſſerts the power of faith;—to avoid giving offence pays the tribute, though entitled to exemption:—humility the road to eminence, in the reign of heaven;—the meaneſt diſciple not to be deſpiſed:—ſnares and offences to be avoided:—the method of reclaiming an offending brother:—perſonal injuries, though often repeated, ſtill to be forgiven:—the implacable not to expect forgiveneſs from God.—the parable of the king who reckoned with his ſervants.

Page 310

SECTION X.

The rich Man's Application.

CH. XIX. XX. 1—16.

What it is that juſtifies divorce;—who they are that ſhould abſtain from marriage:—the people encouraged to bring children to Jeſus;—what muſt be done to obtain eternal life;—how far endeavours after perfection will carry us:—riches a great obſtruction to our admiſſion into the kingdom:—the reward of thoſe who abandon any thing for Jeſus:—God gives gratuitouſly much beyond his promoſe;—illuſtrated by the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.

314

SECTION. XI.

The Entry into Jerusalem.

CH. XX. 17, &c. XXI. XXII. 1—14.

Jeſus travelling to Jeruſalem, foretells his ſufferings and reſurrection;—the application of Zebedee's wife in behalf of her ſons:—Jeſus aſſerts the neceſſity of humility in all who would obtain admiſſion into his kingdom;—gives ſight to two blind men;—rides into Jeruſalem on an aſs, attended by a multitude ſhouting for joy;—drives the traffickers out of the temple;—where he heals the blind and the lame;—devotes the barren fig-tree;—affirms the power of faith;—ſilences the chief prieſts and elders who queſtion him about his authority;—contraſts their character to that of the heathen, in the parable of the man who had two ſons;—paints their ingratitude to God in the parable of the huſbandmen who ill-treated and killed their landlord's meſſengers;—predicts the rejection of the Jews and the admiſſion of the Gentiles into the church:—this further illuſtrated in the parable of the marriage of the king's ſon.

316

SECTION XII.

The Character of the Pharisees.

CH. XXII. 15, &c. XXIII.

Jeſus eludes the artifices of the Phariſees in his manner of teaching that tribute ought to be paid to their rulers;—vindicates the doctrine of the reſurrection againſt the Sadducees;—anſwers the lawyer who queſtioned him about what is moſt eſſential in the law;—puzzles the Phariſees with a paſſage of Scripture which they applied to the Meſſiah;—admoniſhes the people to follow the good inſtructions, not the evil example, of their teachers, who are reproached with obſtructing the acceſs to the kingdom of heaven;—with making religion a maſk to rapacity;—with their falſe zeal in making proſelytes, whom far from reforming they corrupted;—with the encouragement their traditions gave to perjury;—with their exactneſs in things of no moment, whilſt they neglected things of the higheſt;—with their care about the cleanneſs of the outſide, whilſt they left the inſide full of pollution.

320

SECTION XIII.

The Prophecy on Mount Olivet.

CH. XXIV. XXV.

The deſtruction of the temple foretold;—the calamities by which it will be preceded;—the ſigns that the judge is at hand;—the time of the judgment known only to God;—men will be ſurpriſed by it as formerly by the flood;—the neceſſity of activity and vigilance illuſtrated;—by the example of ſervants who expect their maſter's return;—by the parable of the ten virgins;—by the parable of the talents:—account of the procedure at the laſt judgment. *Page* 323

SECTION XIV.

The last Supper.

CH. XXVI. 1—56.

The rulers conſult together about the method of apprehending Jeſus:—a female diſciple anoints his head:—Judas bargains with the chief prieſts to deliver him into their hands:—Jeſus eats the paſſover with his diſciples;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them;—inſtitutes the commemoration of his death;—foretells their deſerting, and Peter's diſowning him:—his deep diſtreſs in the garden:—he is ſeized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas;—rebukes an apoſtle for having recourſe to the ſword. 327

SECTION XV.

The Crucifixion.

CH. XXVI. 57, &c. XXVII. 1—56.

Jeſus is brought before the Sanhedrim;—accuſed of blaſphemy,—and condemned;—is denied by Peter;—Judas, finding that he is condemned, repents his perfidy;—reſtores the price;—and in deſpair kills himſelf:—Jeſus is delivered bound to the Roman procurator;—before whom he is accuſed by the chief prieſts and elders:—Pilate perceiving that the accuſation proceeded from envy, and being warned by his wife, not to do aught againſt Jeſus,—tries in vain to ſave him, by the artifice of granting him to the prayer of the multitude, who were wont to obtain the releaſe of a priſoner at the paſſover:—the multitude, inſtigated by their rulers, demand the releaſe of Barabbas, and the crucifixion of Jeſus:—Pilate, after waſhing his hands to teſtify that he was guiltleſs of this blood, conſents to gratify them:—Jeſus is ſcourged, and mocked, and crucified between two malefactors,—is inſulted on the croſs by perſons of all ranks, fellow-ſufferers not excepted.—his death attended with a preternatural darkneſs, and other prodigies, which ſtrike the Roman centurion and guards with terror. 329

SECTION XVI.

The Resurrection.

CH. XXVII. 57, &c. XXVIII.

The body of Jeſus given to Joſeph of Arimathea, who depoſits it in his own ſepulchre:—the ſepulchre ſecured and watched:—his reſurrection announced at the ſepulchre to ſome pious women by an angel:—Jeſus afterwards appears to them:—the guard bribed by the Jewiſh rules to ſay that the body was ſtolen when they were aſleep:—Jeſus appears to the diſciples in Galilee,—and commiſſions them to teach all nations. 332

THE

THE

G O S P E L

BY

M A T T H E W.

SECTION I.

The Nativity.

1 *THE lineage of Jeſus Chriſt ſon of David, ſon of Abraham.* Lu. 3; 23.
2 *Abraham begat Iſaac. Iſaac begat Jacob. Jacob begat Judah* Gen. 21; 2.
3 *and his brothers. Judah had Pharez and Zarah by Tamar. Pharaz* 25; 24. 29;
4 *begat Hezron. Hezron begat Ram. Ram begat Aminadab. Aminadab* 35. 38; 27.
5 *begat Naſhon. Naſhon begat Salmon. Salmon had Boaz of Rahab.* Ruth, 4; 18.
6 *Boaz had Obed by Ruth. Obed begat Jeſſe. Jeſſe begat David the*
king. David the king had Solomon, *by her who had been wife of* 1 Sam. 16; 1.
7 *Uriah. Solomon begat Rehoboam. Rehoboam begat Abia. Abia* 17; 12. 2
8 *begat Aſa. Aſa begat Jehoſhaphat. Jehoſhaphat begat Joram.* Sam. 12; 24.
9 *Joram begat Uzziah. Uzziah begat Jotham. Jotham begat Ahaz.* 1 Chro. 3;
10 *Ahaz begat Hezekiah. Hezekiah begat Manaſſeh. Manaſſeh begat* 10.
11 *Amon. Amon begat Joſiah. Joſiah had Jeconiah and his brothers,*
12 *about the time of the migration into Babylon. After the migration*
into Babylon, Jeconiah begat Salathiel. Salathiel begat Zerubbabel.
13 *Zerubbabel begat Abiud. Abiud begat Eliakim. Eliakim begat Azor.*
14 *Azor begat Zadoc. Zadoc begat Achim. Achim begat Eliud.*
15 *Eliud begat Eleazar. Eleazar begat Matthan. Matthan begat*
16 *Jacob. Jacob begat Joſeph, the huſband of Mary, of whom was born*

17 *Jeſus, who is called (a) Meſſiah. So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen; from David till the migration into Babylon fourteen; and from the migration into Babylon to the (b) Meſſiah fourteen.*

Lu. 1; 26. 18 *NOW the birth of Jeſus Chriſt happened thus: Mary his mother had been eſpouſed to Joſeph; but before they came together, ſhe proved*
19 *to be with child by the Holy Spirit. Joſeph her huſband being a worthy man, and unwilling to expoſe her, intended to divorce her*
20 *privately. But while he was thinking upon this, a meſſenger of the Lord appearing to him in a dream, ſaid,* Joſeph, ſon of David, ſcruple not to take home Mary thy wife; for her pregnancy is from the
Acts, 4; 12. 21 Holy Spirit. And ſhe ſhall bear a ſon, whom thou ſhalt call Jeſus;
22 for he will ſave the people from their ſins. *In all this, what the Lord*
Is. 7; 14. 23 *had ſpoken by the Prophet was verified, "Behold! the Virgin ſhall "conceive and bear a ſon, who ſhall be called Immanuel; which ſignifieth*
24 *God with us. When Joſeph awoke, he did as the meſſenger of the*
25 *Lord had commanded him, and took home his wife; but knew her not, until ſhe had brought forth her firſt-born ſon, whom he named Jeſus (c).*

Lu. 2; 4. II. *AFTER the birth of Jeſus, at Bethlehem of Judea, in the reign of king Herod, certain eaſtern magians came to Jeruſalem, and*
2 *enquired,* Where is the new-born king of the Jews; for we have ſeen his ſtar in the eaſt country, and are come to do him homage?
3 *King Herod hearing this, was alarmed and all Jeruſalem with him.*
4 *And having aſſembled all the chief prieſts and the ſcribes of the people he*
5 *demanded of them where the Meſſiah ſhould be born? They anſwered,*
Mic. 5; 2. 6 At Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the Prophet. "And
Jo. 7; 42. "thou Bethlehem, in the canton of Judah, art not the leaſt illuſtrious "among the cities of Judah; for out of thee ſhall come a ruler, who "will govern my people Iſrael."
7 *Then Herod having ſecretly called the magians, procured from them*
8 *exact information concerning the time of the ſtar's appearing. And ſending them to Bethlehem, he ſaid,* Go, make an exact inquiry about the child; and when ye have found him, bring me word, that I
9 alſo may go and pay him homage. *Having heard the king, they departed: and lo! the ſtar which had appeared to them in the eaſt country, moved before them, till it came and ſtood over the place where*
Pſ. 72; 9. 10 *the child was. When they again ſaw the ſtar, they rejoiced exceedingly.*
11 *And being come into the houſe, they found the child with Mary his mother;*

(a) Or *Chriſt.* (b) Or *Chriſt.* (c) That is, *Saviour.*

mother; and proſtrating themſelves, did him homage. Then opening their caſkets, they offered, as preſents, gold, frankincenſe, and myrrh.
12 *And being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they went home another way.*

13 *WHEN they were gone, a meſſenger of the Lord appearing to Joſeph in a dream, ſaid,* Ariſe, take the child, with his mother, and flee into Egypt; and remain there till I acquaint thee; for Herod will
14 ſeek the child to deſtroy him. *Accordingly he aroſe, took the child,*
15 *with his mother, and withdrew by night into Egypt, where he continued untill the death of Herod; ſo that what the Lord had ſpoken by the Prophet was verified, "Out of Egypt I recalled my ſon."* Num. 22; 22. Hoſ. 11; 1.
16 *Then Herod finding that he had been deceived by the magians, was highly incenſed, and diſpatched emiſſaries, who ſlew, by his order, all the male children in Bethlehem, and in all its territory, from thoſe entering the ſecond year, down to the time whereof he had procured exact information from the magians. Then was the word of Jeremiah the Prophet*
17
18 *verified, "A cry was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and weeping, and "bitter complaint, Rachel bewailing her children, and refuſing to be "comforted, becauſe they are not."* Jer. 31; 15.
19 *When Herod was dead, a meſſenger of the Lord appearing in a dream*
20 *to Joſeph in Egypt, ſaid,* Ariſe, take the child, with his mother, and go into the land of Iſrael; for they are dead who fought his life.
21 *Accordingly, he aroſe, took the child, with his mother, and went to*
22 *the land of Iſrael; but hearing that Archelaus had ſucceeded his father Herod in the throne of Judea, he was afraid to return thither; and*
23 *being warned in a dream, retired into the diſtrict of Galilee, and reſided in a city named Nazareth; thereby verifying the declaration of the Prophet* [*concerning Jeſus*], *that he ſhould be called a Nazarene.*

SECTION II.

The Baptiſm.

III. *IN thoſe days appeared John the Baptiſt, who cried in the wilderneſs* Mar. 1; 2.
2 *of Judea, ſaying* Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth. Lu. 3; 1.
3 *For this is he of whom the Prophet Iſaiah ſpeaketh in theſe words,* Jo. 1; 6. ch. 4; 17.
"The voice of one proclaiming in the wilderneſs, Prepare a way for (d) ch. 10; 7.
4 *the Lord, make for him a ſtraight paſſage." Now John wore raiment* Iſ. 40; 3.
of camel's hair with a leathern girdle about his waiſt; and his food was locuſts

(*d*) In the Hebrew of Iſaiah, *Jehovah.*

5 *locuſts and wild honey. Then Jeruſalem and all Judea, and all the*
6 *country along the Jordan reſorted to him, and were baptized by him in Jordan, confeſſing their ſins.*
7 *But he ſeeing many Phariſees and Sadducees coming to him to receive baptiſm, ſaid to them,* Offſpring of vipers, who hath prompted you
8 to flee from the impending vengeance? Produce then the proper
Jo. 8; 39. 9 fruit of reformation; and preſume not to ſay within yourſelves, 'We have Abraham for our father,' for I aſſure you that of theſe ſtones
10 God can raiſe children to Abraham. And even now the ax lieth at
ch. 7; 19. the root of the trees: every tree, therefore, which produceth not
Mar. 1; 8. 11 good fruit is felled and turned into fewel. I indeed baptize you in
Lu. 3; 16. water that ye may reform; but he who cometh after me is mightier
Jo. 1; 26. than I, whoſe ſhoes I am not worthy to carry. He will baptize
Acts, 1; 5. 12 you in the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing ſhovel is in his hand; and he will thoroughly cleanſe his grain; he will gather his wheat into the granary, and conſume the chaff in unquenchable fire.

Mar. 1; 9. 13 *THEN came Jeſus from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized by John.*
Lu. 3; 21. 14 *But John excuſed himſelf ſaying,* It is I who need to be bap-
15 tized by thee; and thou comeſt to me! *Jeſus anſwering ſaid unto him,* Permit this at preſent; for thus ought we to ratify every inſtitu-
16 tion. *Then John acquieſced. Jeſus being baptized, no ſooner aroſe out of the water, than heaven was opened to him; and the Spirit of God*
Jo. 1; 37. 17 *appeared, deſcending like a dove, and lighting upon him: while a voice*
ch. 17; 5. *from heaven proclaimed,* This is my beloved Son in whom I delight.
Lu. 9; 35.
2 Pet. 1; 17.

Mar. 1; 12. IV. *THEN was Jeſus conducted by the Spirit into the wilderneſs, to be*
Lu. 4; 1. 2 *tempted by the (e) devil. And after faſting forty days and forty nights,*
3 *he was hungry. Whereupon the tempter accoſting him, ſaid,* If thou
4 be a Son of God, command that theſe ſtones become loaves. *Jeſus*
Deut. 8; 3. *anſwering ſaid,* It is written, "Man liveth not by bread only, but by
5 "every thing which God is pleaſed to appoint." *Then the devil conveyed him into the holy city, and having placed him upon the battlement*
6 *of the temple, ſaid to him,* If thou be a ſon of God, throw thyſelf
Pſ. 91; 11. down; for it is written, "He will give his (*f*) angels the charge "of thee: they ſhall uphold thee in their arms, leſt thou daſh thy
Deut. 6; 16. 7 "foot againſt a ſtone." *Jeſus again anſwered,* It is written, "Thou
8 "ſhalt not make trial of (*g*) the Lord thy God." *Again the devil took him up a very high mountain, whence he ſhowed him all the kingdoms of the*
9 *world in their glory, and ſaid to him,* All theſe will I give thee, if thou

wilt

(*e*) *Traducer.* (*f*) *Meſſengers.* (*g*) *Jehovah.*

10 wilt proſtrate thyſelf and worſhip me. *Jeſus anſwered*, Satan (*h*), begone; for it is written, "Thou ſhalt worſhip the (*i*) Lord thy 11 God, and ſhalt ſerve him only." *Then the devil leaving him, angels came and miniſtred to him.*

Deut. 6; 13. 10; 20. 1 Sam. 7; 3.

12 *NOW Jeſus hearing that John was impriſoned, retired into Galilee;* 13 *and having left Nazareth, reſided at Capernaum, a ſeaport in the con-* 14 *fines of Zebulun and Naphtali, thereby verifying the words of Iſaiah* 15 *the prophet;* "*The canton of Zebulon and the canton of Naphtali,* 16 "*ſituate on the Jordan near the ſea, Galilee of the nations; the people* "*who abode in darkneſs, ſaw a great light, and on thoſe who* 17 "*inhabited a region of the ſhades of death, light hath ariſen.*" *From that time Jeſus began to proclaim, ſaying*, Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.

Mar. 1; 14. Lu. 4; 14. Jo. 4; 43. Is. 9; 1.

18 *Then walking by the ſea of Galilee, he ſaw two brothers, Simon named Peter and Andrew his brother, caſting a drag into the ſea, for* 19 *they were fiſhers. And he ſaid to them*, Come with me, and I will 20 make you fiſhers of men. *Immediately they left the nets and followed* 21 *him. Paſſing on he ſaw other two brothers, James ſon of Zebedee and John his brother, in the bark with their father Zebedee, mending their* 22 *nets, and he called them. They, immediately leaving the bark and their father, followed him.*

ch. 3; 2. ch. 10; 7. Mar. 1; 16. Lu. 5; 1. Jo. 1; 35.

23 *Then Jeſus went over all Galilee, teaching in their ſynagogues, and proclaiming the glad tidings of the reign, and curing every ſort of diſeaſe* 24 *and malady among the people. And his fame ſpread through all Syria, and they brought to him all their ſick, ſeized and tormented with various diſtempers, demoniacs, and lunatics, and paralytics, and he healed* 25 *them. And vaſt multitudes followed him from Galilee, from (k) Decapolis, from Jeruſalem, from Judea, and from the banks of the Jordan.*

ch. 9; 35. Mar. 1; 39. Lu. 4; 15, 44. Mar. 1; 34. Mar 3; 7. Lu. 6; 17.

SECTION III.

The Sermon on the Mount.

V. *JESUS ſeeing ſo great a confluence, repaired to a mountain, and* 2 *having ſat down, his diſciples came to him. Then breaking ſilence, he taught them, ſaying,*

(*h*) *Adverſary.* (*i*) *Jehovah.* (*k*) *A diſtrict of ten cities.*

Lu. 6; 20. 3 HAPPY the poor who repine not; for the kingdom of heaven is
If. 61; 3. 4 theirs! Happy they who mourn; for they ſhall receive conſolation!
Pſ. 37; 11. 5 Happy the meek; for they ſhall inherit the land! Happy they who
If. 65; 13. hunger and thirſt for righteouſneſs; for they ſhall be ſatisfied!
7 Happy the merciful; for they ſhall obtain mercy! Happy the clean
Pſ. 24; 3. 9 in heart; for they ſhall ſee God! Happy the peacemakers; for
1 Pet. 3; 14. 10 they ſhall be called ſons of God! Happy they who ſuffer perſecution
on account of righteouſneſs; for the kingdom of heaven is theirs!
1 Pet. 4; 14. 11 Happy ſhall ye be, when men ſhall revile and proſecute you, and,
12 on my account, accuſe you falſely of every evil thing! Rejoice and
exult; for great is your reward in heaven: for thus they perſecuted
the Prophets who were before you.

Mar. 9; 49. 13 YE are the ſalt of the earth, If the ſalt become inſipid, how ſhall
Lu. 4; 34. its ſaltneſs be reſtored? It is thenceforth fit only to be caſt out and
14 trodden by men. Ye are the light of the world. A city ſituate on
Mar. 4; 21. 15 a mountain muſt be conſpicuous. A lamp is lighted to be put
Lu. 8; 16. —11; 33. not under a corn-meaſure, but on a ſtand, that it may ſhine to all the
1 Pet. 2; 12. 16 family. Thus, let your light ſhine before men, that they ſeeing
your good actions, may glorify your Father who is in heaven.
17 Think not that I am come to ſubvert the law or the prophets.
Lu. 16; 17. 18 I am come not to ſubvert, but to ratify. For verily I ſay unto you,
Heaven and earth ſhall ſooner periſh, than one iota, or one
Ja. 2; 10. 19 tittle of the law ſhall periſh without attaining its end. Whoſoever,
therefore, ſhall violate, or teach others to violate, were it the leaſt
of theſe commandments, ſhall be in no eſteem in the reign of heaven;
but whoſoever ſhall practiſe and teach them, ſhall be highly eſteemed
20 in the reign of heaven. For I warn you, that unleſs your righteouſ-
neſs excel the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall
never enter the kingdom of heaven.

Ex. 20; 13. 21 YE have heard that it was ſaid to the ancients, "Thou ſhalt not
Deut. 5; 17. "commit murder; for whoſoever committeth murder ſhall be ob-
22 "noxious to the judges." But I ſay unto you, 'Whoſoever is
'angry with his brother unjuſtly, ſhall be obnoxious to the judges;
'whoever ſhall call him fool, ſhall be obnoxious to the council; but
'whoever ſhall call him miſcreant, ſhall be obnoxious to hell-fire.'
23 Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there recollect that
24 thy brother hath ground to complain of thee; leave there thy gift
before the altar: firſt go and procure reconciliation with thy brother,
Lu. 12; 58. 25 then come, and offer thy gift. Compound betimes with thy creditor,
while ye are on the road together; leſt the creditor conſign thee to
the judge; and the judge conſign thee to the officer, and thou be

thrown

26 thrown into priſon. Verily I ſay unto thee; thou wilt not be releaſed
until thou haſt diſcharged the laſt farthing.
27 Ye have heard that it was ſaid, "Thou ſhalt not commit adul- Ex. 20; 14.
28 "tery." But I ſay unto you, 'Whoſoever looketh on another Deut. 5; 18.
'man's wife, in order to cheriſh impure deſire, hath already com-
29 'mitted adultery with her in his heart.' Therefore, if thy right eye ch. 18; 8.
enſnare thee, pluck it out, and throw it away: it is better for thee Mar. 9; 43.
to loſe one of thy members, than that thy whole body be caſt into
30 hell. And if thy right hand inſnare thee, cut it off, and throw it
away: it is better for thee to loſe one of thy members, than that thy
whole body be caſt into hell.
31 It hath been ſaid, "Whoſoever would diſmiſs his wife, let him Deut. 24; 1.
32 "give her a writ of divorce." But I ſay unto you, 'Whoſoever ch. 19; 7.
'ſhall diſmiſs his wife, except for whoredom, is the occaſion that Lu. 16; 18
'ſhe becometh an adultereſs; and whoſoever marrieth her that is diſ- 1 Cor. 7; 10.
'miſſed, committeth adultery.'
33 Again, ye have heard that it was ſaid to the ancients, "Thou Ex. 20; 7.
"ſhalt not forſwear thyſelf, but ſhalt perform thy oaths to the Lev. 19; 12.
Deut. 5; 11.
34 "Lord." But I ſay unto you, 'Swear not at all; neither by heaven, Ja. 5; 12.
'for it is God's throne, nor by the earth, for it is his footſtool;
35 'neither ſhalt thou ſwear by Jeruſalem, for it is the city of the great
36 'king; nor by thy head, becauſe thou canſt not make one hair
37 'white or black.' But let your yes be yes, your no, no; for what-
ever exceedeth theſe, proceedeth from evil.
38 Ye have heard that it was ſaid, "Eye for eye, and tooth for Ex. 21; 24.
39 "tooth." But I ſay unto you, Reſiſt not the injurious. But if Lev. 24; 20.
any one ſtrike thee on the right cheek, turn to him alſo the left. Deut. 19; 21.
Lu. 6; 27.
40 Whoever will ſue thee for thy coat, let him have thy mantle like- 1 Cor. 6; 7.
41 wiſe. And if a man conſtrain thee to go one mile with him, go
42 two. Give to him that aſketh thee; and him that would borrow Deut. 15; 7.
from thee, put not away.
43 Ye have heard that it was ſaid, "Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour, Lev. 19; 18.
44 "and hate thine enemy." But I ſay unto you, Love your enemies;
bleſs them who curſe you; do good to them who hate you; and Ro. 12; 20.
45 pray for them who arraign and proſecute you; that ye may be
children of your Father in heaven, who maketh his ſun ariſe on bad
46 and good, and ſendeth rain on juſt and unjuſt. For if ye love them
only who love you, what reward can ye expect? Do not even the
47 publicans ſo? And if ye ſhow courteſy to your friends only, wherein
48 do ye excell? Do not even the pagans as much? Be ye therefore Eph. 5; 1.
perfect, as your father who is in heaven is perfect.

VI. TAKE

VI. TAKE heed that ye perform not your religious duties before men, in order to be obſerved by them; otherwiſe ye will obtain no reward from your Father who is in heaven.

2 When, therefore, thou giveſt alms, do not proclaim it by ſound of trumpet, as the hypocrites do, in the aſſemblies and in the ſtreets; that they may be extolled by men. Verily, I ſay unto you, they have
3 received their reward. But thou, when thou giveſt alms, let not thy
4 left hand know what thy right hand doth; that thine alms may be in ſecret; and thy Father, to whom nothing is ſecret, will himſelf recompenſe thee.

5 And when thou prayeſt, be not like the hypocrites, who affect to pray ſtanding in the aſſemblies, and at the corners of the ſtreets, that men may obſerve them. Verily I ſay unto you, they have received
6 their reward But thou, when thou wouldſt pray, retire to thy cloſet; and, having ſhut the door, pray to thy Father; and thy Father, to whom, though he is unſeen himſelf, nothing is ſecret, will recom-
Eccleſ. 5; 2. 7 penſe thee. And in prayer talk not idly as the pagans, who think
Ecclus 7; 14. 8 that uſing many words will procure them acceptance. Imitate them not, for your Father knoweth what things ye want, before ye aſk
Lu. 11; 2. 9 him. Thus, therefore, pray ye: 'Our Father, who art in heaven,
11 'thy name be hallowed; thy reign come; thy will be done upon the
12 'earth, as it is in heaven; give us to-day our daily bread; forgive
13 'us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and abandon us not to 'temptation, but preſerve us from evil. [For thine is the kingdom,
Ecclus 28; 1. 14 'and the power, and the glory for ever. Amen.]' For, if ye forgive others their treſpaſſes, your heavenly Father will alſo forgive
ch. 18; 35. Mar. 11; 25. Ja. 2, 13. 15 you: but if ye forgive not others their treſpaſſes, neither will your Father forgive your treſpaſſes.

16 Moreover, when ye faſt, look not diſmal, as the hypocrites, who disfigure their faces, that men may obſerve that they faſt. Verily I
17 ſay unto you, they have received their reward. But thou, when
18 thou faſteſt, anoint thy head, and waſh thy face; that thy faſting may not appear to men, but to thy Father; and thy Father, to whom, though he is unſeen himſelf, nothing is ſecret, will recompenſe thee.

Lu. 12; 33. 19 AMASS not for yourſelves treaſure upon the earth, where moths
1 Tim. 6; 10, 19. 20 or ruſt may conſume it, or thieves breaking in may ſteal it. But provide for yourſelves treaſure in heaven, where are neither moths
Lu. 11; 34. 21 nor ruſt to conſume it, nor thieves to break in and ſteal it. For
22 where your treaſure is, your heart will alſo be. The lamp of the body is the eye. If, therefore, thine eye be ſound, thy whole body

23 will be enlightened: but if thine eye be diſtempered, thy whole body will be dark. And if even the light which is in thee be darkneſs how great will the darkneſs be?

24 A man cannot ſerve two maſters; for either he will hate one, and love the other; or at leaſt will attend one and neglect the other. Lu. 16; 13.

25 Ye cannot ſerve God and (*l*) Mammon. Therefore I charge you; be not anxious about your life, what ye ſhall eat, or what ye ſhall drink; nor about your body, what ye ſhall wear. Is not life a Pſ. 55; 22. Lu. 12; 22. 1 Pet. 5; 7.

26 greater gift than food; and the body than raiment? Obſerve the fowls of heaven. They neither ſow nor reap. They have no ſtorehouſe: but your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye

27 much more valuable than they? Beſides; which of you can by his

28 anxiety prolong his life one hour? and why are ye anxious about raiment? Mark the lilies of the field. How do they grow? They

29 toil not: they ſpin not. Yet I affirm that even Solomon, in all his

30 glory, was not equally adorned with one of theſe. If then God ſo array the herbage which to-day is in the field, and to-morrow will be caſt into the oven; will he not much more array you, O ye

31 diſtruſtful! Therefore ſay not anxiouſly, as the heathens do, What ſhall we eat; or what ſhall we drink; or wherewith ſhall we be

32 clothed? For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all theſe

33 things. But ſeek firſt the kingdom of God and the righteouſneſs required by him; and all theſe things ſhall be ſuperadded to you.

34 Be not then anxious about the morrow: the morrow will be anxious about itſelf. Sufficient for every day is its own trouble.

VII. JUDGE not that ye be not judged; for as ye judge, ye ſhall be judged; and with the meaſure wherewith ye give, ye ſhall receive. Lu. 6; 37. Ro. 2; 1.

3 And why obſerveſt thou the mote in thy brother's eye, but art inſen-

4 ſible of the thorn in thine own eye? Or how dareſt thou ſay to thy brother, 'Let me take the mote out of thine eye;' thou who haſt Mar. 4; 24. Lu. 6; 41.

5 a thorn in thine own? Hypocrite, firſt take the thorn out of thine own eye; then thou wilt ſee to take the mote out of thy brother's eye.

6 Give not that which is holy to dogs, and caſt not your pearls before ſwine, leſt they trample them under foot, or turn upon you and tear you.

7 Aſk, and ye ſhall obtain; ſeek, and ye ſhall find; knock, and ch. 21; 22.

8 the door ſhall be opened to you. For whoſoever aſketh obtaineth; Mar. 11; 24.
whoſoever ſeeketh, findeth; and to every one who knocketh, the Lu. 11; 9.

9 door is opened. Who amongſt you men would give his ſon a ſtone, Jo. 16; 24.

 when Ja. 1; 5.

(*l*) *Riches.*

10 when he aſketh bread; or a ſerpent, when he aſketh a fiſh? If ye
then, though evil, can give good things to your children, how much
more will your Father who is in heaven, give good things to them
that aſk him?

Lu. 6; 31. 12 Whatſoever ye would that others do to you, do ye alſo to
Lu. 13; 24. 13 them; for this is the law and the Prophets. Enter through the ſtrait
gate; for wide is the gate of perdition, broad is the way leading
14 thither; and many are they who enter by it. But how ſtrait is the
gate of life; how narrow the way leading thither; and how few are
they who find it?

15 Beware of falſe teachers, who come to you in the garb of ſheep,
Lu. 6; 43. 16 while inwardly they are ravenous wolves. By their fruits ye ſhall
diſcover them. Are grapes gathered from thorns: or figs from thiſtles?
17 Every good tree yieldeth good fruit; and every evil tree evil fruit.
18 A good tree cannot yield evil fruit, nor an evil tree good fruit.
ch. 3; 10. 19 Every tree which yieldeth not good fruit is felled, and turned into
20 fewel. Wherefore, by their fruits ye ſhall diſcover them.

21 NOT every one who ſaith unto me, Maſter, maſter, ſhall enter
ch. 25; 11. the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will of my Father who
Lu. 6; 46. 22 is in heaven. Many will ſay to me on that day, 'Maſter,
Acts, 19; 13. 'maſter, have we not taught in thy name, and in thy name expelled
Ro. 2; 13.
Ja. 1; 22. 23 'demons; and in thy name performed many miracles?' To whom I
Lu. 13; 27. will declare, 'I never knew you. Depart from me ye who practiſe
iniquity.'

6; 47. 24 Therefore, whoſoever heareth theſe my precepts, and doth them,
I will compare to a prudent man, who built his houſe upon the rock.
25 For although the rain deſcended, and the rivers overflowed, and the
winds blew and beat upon that houſe, it fell not, becauſe it was
26 founded upon the rock. But whoſoever heareth theſe my precepts,
and doth them not, ſhall be compared to a fool, who built his houſe
27 upon the ſand. For when the rain deſcended, and the rivers over-
flowed, and the winds blew, and daſhed againſt that houſe, it fell,
and great was its ruin.

Mar. 1; 22. 28 *WHEN Jeſus had ended this diſcourſe, the people were aſtoniſhed*
Lu. 4; 32. 29 *at his manner of teaching: for he taught as one who had authority, and*
not as the ſcribes.

SECTION

SECTION IV.

Several Miracles.

VIII. *BEING come down from the mountain followed by a great multitude,*
2 *a leper came, who, proſtrating himſelf before him, ſaid,* Sir, if
3 thou wilt, thou canſt cleanſe me. *Jeſus ſtretched out his hand and* Mar. 1; 40.
touched him, ſaying, I will; be thou cleanſed. *Immediately he was* Lu. 5; 12.
4 *cured of his leproſy. Then Jeſus ſaid to him,* See thou tell nobody; Lev. 14; 2.
but go, ſhow thyſelf to the prieſt, and make the oblation preſcribed
by Moſes, for notifying [the cure] to the people.
5 *Having entered Capernaum, a centurion (m) accoſted him with this* Lu. 7; 1.
6 *requeſt,* Sir, my man-ſervant lieth ſick at home, exceedingly afflicted
7 with a palſy. *Jeſus anſwered,* I will go and cure him. *The centurion*
8 *replying, ſaid,* Sir, I have not deſerved that thou ſhouldſt come
under my roof; only ſay the word, and my ſervant will be healed.
9 For even I, who am under command myſelf, having ſoldiers under
me, ſay to one, 'Go,' and he goeth; to another, 'Come,' and he
10 cometh; and to my ſervant, 'Do this,' and he doth it. *Jeſus*
hearing this, was aſtoniſhed, and ſaid to thoſe who followed, Verily I
11 ſay unto you, not even in Iſrael have I found ſo great faith. But I Mal. 1; 11.
aſſure you, that many will come from the eaſt and from the weſt, and
will be placed at table with Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob, in the
12 kingdom of heaven, while the ſons of the kingdom ſhall be thruſt out
13 into darkneſs, where will be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth. *Then*
Jeſus ſaid to the centurion, Go home; be it to thee according to thy
faith. *That inſtant his ſervant was cured.*
14 *Then Jeſus having entered Peter's houſe, ſaw his wife's mother* Mar. 1; 29.
15 *lying ſick of a fever; and having touched her hand, the fever left her;* Lu. 4; 38.
whereupon ſhe aroſe and entertained him.
16 *In the evening, they preſented to him many demoniacs; and he ex-* Mar. 1; 32.
17 *pelled the ſpirits with a word, and cured all the ſick; thus verifying* Lu. 4; 40.
the ſaying of the Prophet Iſaiah, "*He hath himſelf carried off our in-* Iſ. 53; 4.
"*firmities and borne our diſtreſſes.*
18 *Jeſus ſeeing himſelf crowded on all ſides, gave orders to paſs to the*
19 *oppoſite ſhore. Mean time a ſcribe accoſted him, ſaying,* Rabbi, I will Lu. 9; 57.
20 follow thee whitherſoever thou goeſt. *Jeſus anſewered,* The foxes
have caverns, and the birds of the air have places of ſhelter, but
the Son of Man hath not where to repoſe his head.

Another,

(*m*) A Roman officer who had the command of 100 ſoldiers.

Lu. 9; 59 21 *Another, one of his diſciples, ſaid to him,* Maſter, permit me to go
22 firſt, and bury my father. *Jeſus anſwered,* Follow me and let the dead bury their dead.

Mar. 4; 37. 23 *THEN entering the bark, his diſciples followed him. Soon after*
there aroſe in the ſea ſo great a tempeſt, that the bark was covered with
Lu. 8; 23. 25 *the billows. But he being aſleep, his diſciples came and waked him,*
26 *ſaying,* Save us, Maſter, we periſh. *He anſwered,* Why are ye timorous, O ye diſtruſtful? *Then he aroſe, and having commanded the*
winds and the ſea, a great calm enſued; inſomuch, that every one exclaim-
27 *ed with admiration,* What perſonage is this, whom even the winds and the ſea obey!

Mar. 5; 1. 28 *When he was come to the other ſide, into the country of the Gadarenes,*
Lu. 8; 26. *there met him two demoniacs, iſſuing out of the monuments, ſo furious,*
29 *that nobody durſt paſs that way. Theſe inſtantly cried, ſaying,* What haſt thou to do with us, Jeſus, Son of God? Art thou come hither
30 to torment us before the time? *Now there was feeding at ſome diſ-*
31 *tance, a great herd of ſwine. And the fiends beſought him, ſaying,* If
32 thou expel us, permit us to go into the herd of ſwine. *He anſwered,* Go. *And when they were caſt out, they went into the ſwine; on which*
the whole herd ruſhed down a precipice into the ſea, and periſhed in the
33 *waters. Then the herdſmen fled into the city, and reported every thing,*
34 *and what had happened to the demoniacs. Preſently the whole city went*
out to meet Jeſus, and having ſeen him, entreated him to depart out of
their territory.

IX. *Then having gone aboard the bark, he repaſſed, and went to his own*
Mar. 2; 3. 2 *city; where they brought to him a paralytic, laid upon a bed. Jeſus*
Lu. 5; 18. *perceiving their faith, ſaid to the paralytic.* Son, take courage, thy
Lu. 7; 48. 3 ſins are forgiven thee. *Whereupon ſome of the ſcribes ſaid within them-*
4 *ſelves,* 'This man blaſphemeth. *But Jeſus knowing their ſentiments,*
5 *ſaid,* Why do ye harbour evil thoughts? which is eaſier; to ſay, 'Thy ſins are forgiven;' or to ſay [with effect], 'Ariſe and walk.'
6 But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power upon the earth to forgive ſins, Ariſe, *(ſaid he then to the paralytic),* take up thy
7 bed and go home. *Accordingly he aroſe, and went home. And the*
people ſaw and wondered, glorifying God, who had given ſuch power to
men.

Mar. 2; 14. 9 *As Jeſus departed thence, he ſaw a man, named Matthew, ſitting at*
Lu. 5; 27. *the toll-office; to whom he ſaid,* Follow me. *And he aroſe and followed*
him.

Mar. 2; 15. 10 *Afterwards Jeſus, being at meat in a houſe, many publicans and*
Lu. 5; 29. *ſinners came, and placed themſelves at table with him and his diſciples.*
11 *Some Phariſees obſerving this, ſaid to his diſciples,* Why doth your

12 teacher eat with publicans and ſinners? *Jeſus hearing them, anſwer-*
13 *ed*, The whole need not a phyſician but the ſick. Go, therefore, Hoſ. 6; 6.
and learn what this meaneth, "I require humanity, and not ſacrifice:" ch. 12; 7.
for I came to call, not the righteous, but ſinners [to reformation.] 1 Tim. 1; 15.
14 *Then John's diſciples accoſting him, ſaid*, We and the Phariſees Mar. 2; 18.
15 often faſt: why do thy diſciples never faſt? *Jeſus anſwered*, Do the Lu. 5; 33.
bridemen mourn, while the bridegroom is with them? But the time
will come when the bridegroom ſhall be taken from them, and then
16 they will faſt. Nobody mendeth an old garment with undreſſed cloth;
elſe the patch itſelf teareth the garment, and maketh a greater rent.
17 Neither do people put new wine into old leathern bottles; otherwiſe
the bottles burſt: and thus, both the wine is ſpilt, and the bottles are
rendered uſeleſs. But they put new wine into new bottles, and both
are preſerved.
18 *While he was ſpeaking, a ruler came, and proſtrating himſelf, ſaid*, Mar. 5; 22.
My daughter is by this time dead; but come, and lay thy hand upon Lu. 8; 41.
19 her, and ſhe will revive. *And Jeſus aroſe, and, as he followed him,*
20 *with his diſciples, a woman, who had been twelve years afflicted with* Mar. 5; 25.
21 *a bloody iſſue, coming behind, touched the tuft of his mantle, for ſhe* Lu. 8; 43.
22 *ſaid within herſelf, 'If I but touch his mantle, I ſhall recover:' Jeſus*
turning about, ſaw her, and ſaid, Daughter, take courage, thy faith
hath cured thee. *And the woman was well from that inſtant.*
23 *Being come into the ruler's houſe, and ſeeing the players on the flute,* Mar. 5; 38.
24 *with the crowd making a buſtle, he ſaid to them*, Withdraw, for the Lu. 8; 51.
25 damſel is not dead, but aſleep. *And they derided him: But when the*
people were put out, he entered, and having taken her by the hand, the
26 *damſel aroſe. Now the fame of this action ſpread through all that*
country.
27 *When Jeſus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying*,
28 Son of David, have pity upon us. *Being come into the houſe, the*
blind men approached: and Jeſus ſaid to them, Do ye believe that I
29 can do this? *They anſwered*, Yes, Maſter. *Then he touched their*
30 *eyes, ſaying*, Be it unto you according to your faith. *Immediately*
their eyes were opened. And Jeſus ſtrictly charging them, ſaid, Take
31 care that nobody know it. *But being departed, they ſpread his fame*
through all that country.
32 *They were ſcarcely gone, when a dumb demoniac was preſented to him.* Lu. 11; 14.
33 *The demon being expelled, the dumb ſpake, and the people wondered,* ch. 12; 22.
34 *ſaying*, Nothing like this was ever ſeen in Iſrael. *But the Phariſees*
ſaid, He expelleth the demons by the prince of demons. Mar. 3; 22.

SECTION V.

The Charge to the Apoſtles.

Mar. 6; 6. Lu. 13; 22. 35 *THEN Jeſus went through all the cities and villages, teaching in their ſynagogues, and proclaiming the glad tidings of the reign, and*
Mar. 6; 34. 36 *and curing every diſeaſe and every malady among the people. But when he ſaw the multitudes, he had compaſſion upon them, becauſe they*
Lu. 10; 2. 37 *were ſcattered and expoſed, like a flock without a ſherherd. Then he ſaid to his diſciples.* The harveſt is plentiful, but the reapers are few:
38 entreat, therefore, the Lord of the harveſt, th a he would ſend labourers to reap it.

Mar 3; 13. Lu. 9; 1. Lu. 7; 13. X. *And having called to him his twelve diſciples, he gave them power to expel unclean ſpirits, and to cure diſeaſes and maladies of every kind.*
2 *Now theſe are the names of the twelve Apoſtles (n). The firſt Simon, called Peter, and Andrew his brother, James, ſon of Zebedee, and*
3 *John his brother, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the Publican, James ſon of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, ſurnamed Thaddeus,*
4 *Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iſcariot, he who betrayed him. Theſe twelve Jeſus commiſſioned, inſtructing them, and ſaying,*

Acts, 13; 46. Lu. 10; 9. 6 Go not away to the Gentiles, nor enter a Samaritan city: but go
7 directly to the loſt ſheep of the ſtock of Iſrael. And as ye go, pro-
8 claim, ſaying, 'The reign of heaven approacheth.' Heal the ſick; cleanſe lepers, expel demons; freely ye have received, freely give.
Mar. 6; 8. Lu. 9; 3. Lu. 10; 7. 1 Tim. 5; 18. 9 Put not gold, or ſilver, or braſs in your girdles; carry no ſcrip, nor two coats, ſtaves, or pairs of ſhoes; for the workman is worthy of his maintenance.
11 And whatever city or village ye enter, enquire what perſon of
12 worth dwelleth there; and abide with him until ye leave the place.
13 When ye enter the houſe, ſalute the family. If the family be worthy, the peace ye wiſh them ſhall come upon them: If they be not worthy,
14 it ſhall rebound upon yourſelves. Whereſoever they will not receive you, nor regard your words, in departing that houſe or city, ſhake
Acts, 13; 51. 15 the duſt off your feet. Verily I ſay unto you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrah ſhall be more tolerable on the day of judgment, than the condition of that city.
Lu. 10; 3. 16 Behold! I ſend you forth as ſheep amidſt wolves. Be, therefore,
17 prudent as the ſerpents, and harmleſs as the doves. But be upon your

(n) *Miſſionaries.*

your guard with men; for they will deliver you to councils, and ch. 24; 9.
18 ſcourge you in their ſynagogues; and ye ſhall be brought before
governors and kings, on my account, to bear teſtimony to them,
19 and to the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, be not anxious Mar. 13; 11.
how, or what ye ſhall ſpeak; for what ye ſhould ſpeak ſhall be Lu. 12; 11.
20 ſuggeſted to you in that moment. For it ſhall not be ye that
ſhall ſpeak; but the ſpirit of my Father who will ſpeak by you.
21 Then the brother will conſign the brother to death; and the father Lu. 21; 16.
the child; and children will ariſe againſt their parents, and procure
22 their death. And for my name ye ſhall be hated univerſally. But
the man who perſevereth to the end, ſhall be ſaved.
23 Therefore, when they perſecute you in one city, flee to another;
for Verily I ſay unto you, ye ſhall not have gone through the cities
24 of Iſrael ere the Son of Man be come. A diſciple is not above his Lu. 6; 40.
25 teacher, nor a ſervant above his maſter. It is enough for the diſciple Jo. 13; 16. & 15; 20.
to be as his teacher, and for the ſervant to be as his maſter. If they
have called the maſter of the houſe Belzebub, how much more will
they call his domeſtics?
26 Therefore, fear them not; for there is nothing hidden that ſhall Mar. 4; 22.
27 not be detected; nothing ſecret that ſhall not be known. What I Lu. 8; 17. & 12; 2.
tell you in the dark, publiſh in the light; and what is whiſpered in
28 your ear, proclaim from the houſe tops. And fear not them who
kill the body, but cannot kill the ſoul; fear rather him who can
29 deſtroy both ſoul and body in hell. Are not two ſparrows ſold for
a penny (*o*)? Yet neither of them falleth to the ground without your
30 Father. Nay, the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear
32 not then, ye are much more valuable than ſparrows. Whoſoever, Lu. 12; 8.
therefore, ſhall acknowledge me before men, him will I alſo ac- & 9; 26.
33 knowledge before my father who is in heaven. But whoſoever ſhall Mar. 8; 38. 2 Tim. 2; 12.
diſown me before men, him will I alſo diſown before my Father who
is in heaven.
34 Think not that I am come to bring peace to the earth. I came, Lu. 12; 51.
35 not to bring peace, but a ſword. For I am come to breed diſſention Mic. 7; 5.
betwixt father and ſon, betwixt mother and daughter, betwixt
36 mother-in-law and daughter-in-law; ſo that a man's enemies will be
37 found in his own family. He who loveth father or mother more Lu. 14; 26.
than me, is not worthy of me. He who loveth ſon or daughter
38 more than me, is not worthy of me. He who will not take his ch. 16; 24.
39 croſs and follow me, is not worthy of me. He who preſerveth his Mar. 8; 34. Jo. 12; 25. Lu. 9; 23. & 17; 33.
life, ſhall loſe it: but he who loſeth his life, on my account, ſhall
preſerve it.

He

(*o*) *Aſſarion*, value three farthings ſterling.

Lu. 10; 16. Jo. 13; 20. 40 He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me,
41 receiveth him who ſent me. He that receiveth a prophet, becauſe
he is a prophet, ſhall obtain a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth
a righteous man, becauſe he is a righteous man, ſhall obtain a
Mar. 9; 41. 42 righteous man's reward: and whoſoever ſhall give any of theſe little
ones, becauſe he is my diſciple, were it but a cup of cold water to
drink; verily I ſay unto you, he ſhall not loſe his reward.

XI. *When Jeſus had made an end of inſtructing his twelve diſciples, he departed thence to teach and give warning in the cities.*

SECTION VI.

The Character of the Times.

Lu. 7; 18. 2 *NOW John having heard in priſon of the works of the Meſſiah,*
3 *ſent two of his diſciples who aſked him,* Art thou he that cometh,
4 or muſt we expect another? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them,* Go and
If. 35; 5. 5 relate to John what he have heard and ſeen. The blind are made to
If. 61; 1. ſee, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear; lepers are cleanſed; the dead
6 are raiſed, and good news is brought to the poor: and happy is he, to
whom I ſhall not prove a ſtumbling block.
Lu. 7; 24. 7 *When they were departed, Jeſus ſaid to the people concerning John,*
What went ye out into the wilderneſs to behold? A reed ſhaken by
8 the wind? But what went ye to ſee? A man effeminately dreſſed?
9 It is kings palaces [not deſerts] that ſuch frequent. What then went
ye to ſee? A prophet? Yea, I tell you, and ſomething ſuperior to
Mal. 3; 1. 10 a prophet: For this is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold
Mar. 1; 2. 11 "I ſend mine angel before thee, who ſhall prepare thy way." Verily
I ſay unto you, among thoſe that are born of women, there hath not
ariſen a greater than John the Baptiſt. Yet the leaſt in the reign of
Lu. 16; 16. 12 heaven ſhall be greater than he. From the firſt appearing of John the
Baptiſt until now, the kingdom of heaven is invaded, and invaders
13 take poſſeſſion by force. For till John appeared, all the Prophets
14 and the law were your inſtructors. And if ye will bear to be told it,
Mal. 4; 5. 15 this is the Elijah that was to come. Whoever hath ears to hear, let
him hear.
Lu. 7; 31. 16 But to what ſhall I liken this generation? It is like boys in the
17 market-place, to whom their play-fellows complain, ſaying, 'We
'have played to you upon the pipe, but ye have not danced; we
18 'have ſung mournful ſongs to you, but ye have not lamented.' For
John came abſtaining from meat and drink, and they ſay, He hath a

19 demon; the Son of Man came uſing meat and drink, and they ſay,
'He is a lover of banquets and wine, a companion of publicans and
'ſinners.' But wiſdom is juſtified by her children.
20 *Then he began to reproach the cities wherein moſt of his miracles had* Lu. 10; 13.
21 *been performed, becauſe they repented not.* Wo unto thee Chorazin,
wo unto thee Bethſaida; for if the miracles which have been perform-
ed in you, had been performed in Tyre and Sidon, they had re-
22 pented long ago in ſackcloth and aſhes. Know, therefore, that the
condition of Tyre and Sidon on the day of judgment ſhall be more
23 tolerable than yours. And thou Capernaum, which haſt been exalted
to heaven, ſhall be brought down to hades; for if the miracles
which have been performed in thee, had been performed in Sodom,
24 it had remained until now. Know, therefore, that the condition
of Sodom on the day of judgment, ſhall be more tolerable than
thine.
25 *On that occaſion Jeſus ſaid,* I adore thee, O Father, Lord of heaven Lu. 10; 21.
and earth; becauſe having hidden theſe things from ſages and the learn-
26 ed, thou haſt revealed them to babes: Yes, Father, becauſe ſuch is thy
27 pleaſure. My Father hath imparted every thing to me; and none Jo. 3; 35, & 6; 46. & 10; 15.
knoweth the Son, except the Father; neither knoweth any one the
Father, except the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.
28 Come unto me all ye who toil and are burdened; and I will relieve Jer. 6; 16.
29 you. Take my yoke upon you, and be taught by me; for I am
30 meek and condeſcending: and your ſouls ſhall find relief. For my 1 Jo. 5; 3.
yoke is eaſy, and my burden is light.

XII. *AT that time, as Jeſus was walking through the corn on (p) the Sab-* Mar. 2; 23;
bath, his diſciples, being hungry, began to pluck the ears of corn, and eat Lu. 6; 1.
2 *them. The Phariſees obſerving this, ſaid to him,* Lo! thy diſciples are do-
3 ing what it is not lawful to do on the Sabbath. *He anſwered,* Have 1 Sam. 21; 1.
ye not read what David did and his attendants when they were hungry?
4 how he entered the tabernacle of God, and eat the loaves of the pre-
ſence, which it was not lawful for him or his attendants to eat, but
5 ſolely for the prieſts? Or have ye not learnt from the law that the Lev. 24; 5.
prieſts in the temple violate the reſt to be obſerved on Sabbaths, and Num. 28; 9.
6 are nevertheleſs blameleſs? Now I affirm that ſomething greater than
7 the temple is here. But had ye known what this meaneth, "I require Hoſ. 6; 6.
humanity and not ſacrifice," ye would not have condemned the guilt-
8 leſs: For the Son of Man is maſter of the Sabbath. ch. 9; 13.

(p) With us *Saturday*, or rather from Friday at ſun-ſet, to Saturday at ſun-ſet, for ſo the Jews reckoned.

Mar. 3; 1. Lu. 6; 6. 9 *Leaving that place, he went into their ſynagogue, and found a man*
there whoſe hand was blaſted. They aſked him with a deſign to accuſe
11 *him,* Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath? *He anſwered,* What man is
there amongſt you, who having one ſheep, if it fall into a pit on the
12 Sabbath, will not lay hold on it, and lift it out? And doth not a man
greatly excel a ſheep; It is lawful, therefore, to do good on the
13 Sabbath. *Then he ſaid to the man,* Stretch out thy hand. *And as he*
ſtretched it out, it became ſound like the other. But the Phariſees went
out and concerted againſt him to deſtroy him.
15 *Jeſus, knowing this, departed, and being followed by a vaſt multitude,*
16 *healed all their ſick, enjoining them not to diſcover him. Thus the word*
Iſ. 42; 1. 18 *of the Prophet Iſaiah was verified,* " *Behold my ſervant whom I have*
" *choſen, my beloved in whom my ſoul delighteth: I will cauſe my Spirit*
19 " *to abide upon him, and he ſhall give laws to the nations; he will not*
20 " *contend, nor clamour, nor make his voice be heard in the ſtreets. A*
" *bruiſed reed he will not break; and a dimly burning taper he will not*
21 " *quench, till he render his laws victorious. Nations alſo ſhall truſt in*
" *his name.*"
22 *Then was brought to him a demoniac dumb and blind; and he cured*
23 *him, inſomuch that he both ſpake and ſaw. And all the people ſaid with*
ch. 9; 34. 24 *amazement,* Is this the ſon of David? *But the Phariſees hearing them*
Mar. 3; 22. *ſaid,* This man expelleth demons only by Beelzebub prince of the
Lu. 11; 15. 25 demons. *But Jeſus knowing their ſurmizes, ſaid to them,* By civil
diſſentions any kingdom may be deſolated; and no city or family,
26 where ſuch diſſentions are, can ſubſiſt. Now if Satan expel Satan,
his kingdom is torn by civil diſſentions; how can it then ſubſiſt;
27 Beſides, if I expel demons by Beelzebub; by whom do your ſons
28 expel them? Wherefore they ſhall be your judges. But if I expel
demons by the Spirit of God, the reign of God hath overtaken you.
29 For how can one who entereth a ſtrong man's houſe, plunder his
goods, unleſs he firſt overpower the ſtrong man? Then indeed he
30 may plunder the houſe. He who is not for me is againſt me: and he
who gathereth not with me ſcattereth.
Mar. 3; 28. Lu. 12; 10. 1 Jo. 5; 16. 31 Wherefore I ſay unto you, though every other ſin and detraction
in men is pardonable, their detraction againſt the Spirit is unpardon-
32 able: for whoſoever ſhall inveigh again the Son of Man may obtain
pardon; but whoſoever ſhall ſpeak againſt the Holy Spirit, ſhall never
33 be pardoned, either in the preſent ſtate or in the future. Either call
the tree good and its fruit good; or call the tree bad and its fruit bad:
Lu. 6; 45. 34 for we diſtinguiſh the tree by the fruit. Offspring of vipers, how can
ye that are evil ſpeak good things, ſince it is out of the fulneſs of the
35 heart that the mouth ſpeaketh. The good man out of his good trea-
ſure produceth good things; the bad man out of his bad treaſure pro-
duceth

36 duceth bad things. Be aſſured, however, that of every pernicious
word which men ſhall utter, they ſhall give an account on the day
37 of judgment. For by thy words thou ſhalt be acquitted; and by thy 1 Cor. 1; 22.
words thou ſhalt be condemned. ch. 16; 1.

38 *Then ſome of the Scribes and Phariſees interpoſed, ſaying*, Rabbi, we Lu. 11; 29.
39 deſire to ſee a ſign from thee. *He anſwering, ſaid unto them*, An evil ch. 16; 4.
and adulterous race demandeth a ſign; but no ſign ſhall be given them,
40 ſave the ſign of the Prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and Jon. 1; 17.
three nights in the ſtomach of the great fiſh, the Son of Man will be
41 three days and three nights in the boſom of the earth. The Ninevites Jon. 3; 5.
will ſtand up in the judgment againſt this race, and cauſe it to be condemned, becauſe they repented when they were warned by Jonah;
42 and behold here ſomething greater than Jonah. The queen of (*q*) 1 Ki. 10; 1.
the ſouth country will ariſe in the judgment againſt this race, and 2 Chr. 9; 1.
cauſe it to be condemned; becauſe ſhe came from the extremities of the earth to hear the wiſe diſcourſes of Solomon; and behold here ſomething greater than Solomon.

43 An unclean ſpirit, when he is gone out of a man, wandereth Lu. 11; 24.
over parched deſarts in ſearch of a reſting-place. And not finding
44 any, he ſaith, 'I will return to my houſe whence I came;' and being
45 come, he findeth it empty, ſwept, and furniſhed. Whereupon he goeth, and bringeth with him ſeven other ſpirits more wicked than himſelf; and having entered, they dwell there; and the laſt ſtate of 2 Pet. 2; 20.
that man becometh worſe than the firſt: thus will it alſo fare with this Heb. 6; 4.
evil race. & 10; 26.

46 *While he diſcourſed to the people, his mother and brothers were without*, Mar. 3; 31.
47 *deſiring to ſpeak with him. And one ſaid to him*, Thy mother and Lu. 8; 19.
48 thy brothers are without, deſiring to ſpeak with thee. *He anſwering, ſaid to him that told him*, Who is my mother? and who are my
49 brothers? *Then ſtretching out his hand towards his diſciples, he ſaid*,
50 Behold my mother and my brothers. For whoſoever doth the will of my Father who is in heaven, is my brother, and ſiſter, and mother.

(*q*) In the Old Teſtament, *Sheba*.

SECTION

SECTION VII.

Parables.

Mar. 4; 1. XIII. *THE ſame day, Jeſus having gone out of the houſe, ſat by the ſea*
2 *ſide; but ſo great a multitude flocked about him, that he went into*
a bark, and ſat down there, while all the people ſtood on the ſhore.
3 *Then he diſcourſed to them of many things in parables.*

Mar. 4; 3. 4 THE ſower, *ſaid he*, went out to ſow; and in ſowing, ſome ſeeds
Lu. 8; 4. 5 fell by the way-ſide, and the birds came and picked them up: ſome
fell on rocky ground, where they had little earth: theſe ſprang up the
6 ſooner, becauſe the ſoil had no depth; but after the ſun had beaten
upon them, they were ſcorched, and having no root, withered away.
7 Some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up and choaked them.
8 Others fell into good ground, and yielded encreaſe, ſome a hundred,
9 ſome ſixty, ſome thirty-fold. Whoever hath ears to hear, let him
hear.

Mar. 4; 10. 10 *Then the diſciples accoſted him, ſaying*, Why ſpeakeſt thou to them
Lu. 1; 9. 11 in parables? *He anſwering, ſaid unto them*, Becauſe it is your privilege,
ch. 25; 29. 12 and not theirs, to know the ſecrets of the reign of heaven. For to him
Mar. 4; 25. that hath more ſhall be given, and he ſhall abound; but from him
Lu. 8; 18. 13 that hath not, even that which he hath ſhall be taken. For this reaſon
14 I ſpeak to them in parables; becauſe they ſeeing, ſee not; and hearing,
Iſ. 6; 9. hear not, nor regard; inſomuch that this prophecy of Iſaiah is ful-
Mar. 4; 12. filled in them, "Ye may indeed liſten, but will not underſtand; ye
Lu. 8; 10. Jo. 12; 39. 15 "may look, but will not perceive. For this people's underſtanding is
Acts, 28; 25. "ſtupified, their ears are deafened, and their eyes they have cloſed;
Rom. 11; 8. "leſt ſeeing with their eyes, hearing with their ears, and appre-
"hending with their underſtanding; they ſhould repent, and I ſhould
Lu. 10; 23. 16 "reclaim them." But bleſſed are your eyes, becauſe they ſee; and
17 your ears, becauſe they hear. For verily I ſay unto you, that many
Prophets and righteous men have deſired to ſee the things which ye
ſee, but have not ſeen them; and to hear the things which ye hear,
but have not heard them.

Mar. 4; 14. 18 Underſtand ye, therefore, the parable of the ſower. When one
Lu. 8; 11. heareth the doctrine of the reign, but mindeth it not, the evil one
cometh, and ſnatcheth away that which was ſown in his heart. This
20 explaineth what fell by the way-ſide. That which fell on rocky ground,
denoteth him who, hearing the word, receiveth it at firſt with pleaſure;
21 yet not having it rooted in his mind, retaineth it but a while; for

when trouble or perſecution cometh, becauſe of the word, inſtantly
22 he relapſeth. That which fell among thorns, denoteth that hearer in whom worldly cares, and the deluſion of riches, ſtifle the word, and
23 render it unfruitful. But that which fell into good ſoil, and bore fruit, ſome a hundred, ſome ſixty, ſome thirty-fold, denoteth him who not only heareth and mindeth, but obeyeth the word.

24 *Another parable he propoſed to them, ſaying*, The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a field in which the proprietor had ſown good
25 grain: but while people were aſleep, his enemy came, and ſowed
26 darnel among the wheat, and went off. When the blade was up, and
27 putting forth the ear, then appeared alſo the darnel. And the ſervants came and ſaid to their maſter, 'Sir, thou ſowedſt good grain in thy
28 field; whence, then, hath it darnel?' He anſwered, 'An enemy 'hath done this.' They ſaid, 'Wilt thou, then, that we weed them
29 'out?' He replied, 'No; leſt in weeding out the darnel, ye tear up
30 'alſo the wheat. Let both grow together until the harveſt; and in 'the time of harveſt, I will ſay to the reapers, Firſt gather the darnel, 'and make them into bundles for burning; then carry the wheat into 'my barn.'

31 *Another ſimilitude he propoſed to them, ſaying*, The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of muſtard-ſeed, which a man ſet in his field; Mar. 4; 31. Lu. 13; 19.
32 for though it is the ſmalleſt of all ſeeds, it is, when grown, larger than any herb, and becometh a tree, ſo that the birds of the air take ſhelter in its branches.

33 *Another ſimilitude he gave them:* The kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman mingled in three meaſures of meal until the whole was leavened. Lu. 13; 21.

34 *All theſe ſimilitudes Jeſus ſpoke to the people; for he taught them only*
35 *by ſimilitudes; herein verifying the word of the Prophet: "I will diſ-* Pſ. 78; 2.
"courſe in parables; I will utter things whereof all antiquity hath been "ſilent."

36 *Then Jeſus, leaving the multitude, retired to the houſe, where his diſciples accoſted him, ſaying*, Explain to us the parable of the darnel
37 in the field. *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them*, He who ſowed the
38 good ſeed is the Son of Man. The field is the world: the good ſeed are the ſons of the kingdom; and the darnel are the ſons of the evil
39 one. The enemy who ſowed them is the devil: the harveſt is the
40 concluſion of this ſtate; and the reapers are the angels. As, therefore, the darnel is gathered and burnt; ſo ſhall it be at the concluſion of this
41 ſtate. The Son of Man will ſend his angels, who ſhall gather out of
42 his kingdom all ſeducers and iniquitous perſons, and throw them into the burning furnace: weeping and gnaſhing of teeth ſhall be there.

Dan. 12; 3. 43 Then ſhall the righteous ſhine like the ſun in the kingdom of their Father. Whoever hath ears to hear, let him hear.

44 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like treaſure hid in a field, which, when a man hath diſcovered, he concealeth the diſcovery, and for joy thereof, ſelleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

45 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a pearl extremely precious, which a merchant, who was in queſt of fine pearls, having met with, ſold all that he had and purchaſed it.

47 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a ſweepnet caſt into the
48 ſea, which encloſeth fiſhes of every kind. When it is full, they draw it aſhore, and gather the good into veſſels, but throw the uſe-
49 leſs away. So ſhall it be at the concluſion of this ſtate. The angels will come and ſever the wicked from among the righteous, and
50 throw them into the burning furnace. Weeping and gnaſhing of teeth ſhall be there.

51 *Jeſus ſaid*, Do ye underſtand all theſe things? *They anſwered*, Yes,
52 Maſter. *He added*, Every ſcribe, therefore, inſtructed for the kingdom of heaven, is like a houſeholder who bringeth out of his ſtore-
53 houſe new things and old. *And after he had finiſhed theſe ſimilitudes, he departed thence.*

SECTION VIII.

The People twice fed in the Deſert.

Mar. 6; 1. Lu. 4; 16. Jo. 6; 42. 54 *JESUS being come into his own country, taught the inhabitants in their ſynagogue: and they ſaid with aſtoniſhment*, Whence hath
55 this man this wiſdom and this power of working miracles? Is not this the carpenter's ſon? Is not his mother called Mary? And are not
56 James, and Joſes, and Simon, and Judas his brothers? His ſiſters too, do they not live amongſt us? Whence then hath HE all theſe
57 things? *Thus they were ſcandalized at him. But Jeſus ſaid to them,*
Jo. 4; 44. A prophet is no where diſregarded, except in his own country, and
58 in his own family. *And he did not many miracles there becauſe of their unbelief.*

Mar. 6; 14. Lu. 9; 7. XIV. *AT that time Herod the tetrarch (r) hearing of the fame of Jeſus,*
2 *ſaid to his ſervants*, This is John the Baptiſt; he is raiſed from the dead; and therefore miracles are performed by him.

For

(q) That is, *governor of a fourth part.*

3 *For Herod had cauſed John to be apprehended, impriſoned, and bound,* Mar. 6; 17.
4 *on account of Herodias his brother Philip's wife; for John had ſaid to* Lu. 3 19.
5 *him,* It is not lawful for thee to have her. *And Herod would have* Lev. 18; 16.
put him to death, but was afraid of the populace, who accounted him a & 20; 11.
6 *prophet. But when Herod's birth-day was kept, the daughter of* ch. 21; 26.
7 *Herodias danced before the company, and pleaſed Herod ſo highly, that*
8 *he ſwore he would grant her whatever ſhe ſhould aſk. She being in-*
ſtigated by her mother, ſaid, Give me here in a baſin the head of
9 John the Baptiſt. *And the king was ſorry; nevertheleſs, from a regard*
to his oath and his gueſts, he commanded that it ſhould be given her.
10 *Accordingly John was beheaded in the priſon by his order. And his*
head was brought in a baſin and preſented to the damſel; and ſhe carried
12 *it to her mother. After which his diſciples went and fetched the body,*
and having buried it, came and told Jeſus.
13 *When Jeſus heard this, he embarked privately, and retired into a* Mar. 6; 36.
deſert place; whereof the people being informed, followed him by land Lu. 9; 10.
14 *out of the cities. Obſerving, as he landed, a great multitude, he had*
compaſſion upon them and healed their ſick.
15 *Towards the evening his diſciples accoſted him, ſaying,* This is a deſert Mar. 6; 35.
place, and the time is now paſt; diſmiſs the multitude, that they Lu. 9; 12.
16 may go to the villages, and buy themſelves victuals. *Jeſus anſwered,* Jo. 6; 5.
17 They need not go. Supply them yourſelves. *They ſaid to him,* We
18 have here but five loaves and two fiſhes. *He replied,* Bring them
19 hither to me. *Then having commanded the people to lie down upon the*
graſs, he took the five loaves and the two fiſhes, and looking towards
heaven, bleſſed them; then breaking the loaves, he gave them to the diſ-
20 *ciples; and they diſtributed them among the people. When all had par-*
taken, and were ſatisfied, they carried off twelve baſkets full of the frag-
21 *ments that remained. Now they that had eaten were about five thouſand*
men, beſide women and children.
22 *Immediately Jeſus obliged his diſciples to embark and paſs over before* Mar. 6; 45.
23 *him, while he diſmiſſed the multitude. Having diſmiſſed the multitude,* Jo. 6; 16.
he retired by himſelf to a mountain to pray, and remained there alone till
24 *it was late. By that time the bark was half way over, toſſed by the*
25 *waves, for the wind was contrary. In the fourth watch of the night (s),*
26 *Jeſus went to them, walking upon the ſea. When the diſciples ſaw him*
walking upon the ſea, being terrified, they exclaimed, An apparition!
27 *and cried out for fear. Jeſus immediately ſpoke to them, ſaying,* Take
28 courage, it is I, be not afraid. *Peter anſwering, ſaid to him,* If it be
29 thou, Maſter, bid me come to thee upon the water. *Jeſus ſaid,* Come.
Then

(s) Between three and ſix in the morning.

Then Peter getting out of the bark, walked upon the water towards
30 *Jeſus, But finding the wind boiſterous, he was frightened; and begin-*
31 *ning to ſink, cried,* Maſter, ſave me. *Jeſus inſtantly ſtretched out his hand, caught him, and ſaid to him,* Diſtruſtful man, wherefore didſt
32 thou doubt? *When they had gone aboard, the wind ceaſed. Then thoſe in the bark came, and proſtrated themſelves before him, ſaying,* Thou art aſſuredly a Son of God.

Mar. 6; 53. 34 *Having paſſed over, they landed on the territory of Genneſaret (t);*
35 *the inhabitants whereof knowing him, ſent through all that country,*
36 *and brought to him all the diſeaſed, who beſought him to let them touch but a tuft of his mantle; and as many as touched, were cured.*

Mar. 7; 1. XV. *Then ſome Scribes and Phariſees of Jeruſalem addreſſed him, ſaying,*
2 Why do thy diſciples tranſgreſs the tradition of the elders? For they
3 waſh not their hands before meals. *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them,* Why do ye yourſelves, by your tradition, tranſgreſs the command-
Ex. 20; 12. 4 ment of God? For God hath commanded, ſaying, "Honour thy
Deut. 5; 16. "father and mother;" and, "Whoſoever revileth father or mother
Ex. 21; 17. Lev. 20; 9. 5 "ſhall be puniſhed with death." But ye affirm, If a man ſay to
Pro. 20; 20. father or mother, 'I devote whatever of mine ſhall profit thee,' he ſhall not afterwards honour, by his aſſiſtance, his father or his mother.
6 Thus, by your tradition, ye annul the commandment of God. Hy-
Is. 29; 13. 8 pocrites, well do ye ſuit the character which Iſaiah gave of you,
9 ſaying, "This people addreſs me with their mouth, and honour me "with their lips, though their heart is eſtranged from me. But "in vain they worſhip me, while they teach inſtitutions merely "human."

Mar. 7; 14. 10 *Then having called the multitude, he ſaid to them,* Hear, and be in-
11 ſtructed. It is not what goeth into the mouth which polluteth the man; but it is what proceedeth out of the mouth which polluteth the
12 man. *Thereupon his diſciples accoſting him, ſaid,* Didſt thou obſerve how the Phariſees, when they heard that ſaying, were ſcandalized?
13 *He anſwered,* Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted,
Lu. 6; 39. 14 ſhall be extirpated. Let them alone. They are blind leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch.

Mar. 7; 17. 15 *Then Peter addreſſing him, ſaid,* Explain to us that ſaying. *Jeſus an-*
17 *ſwered,* Are ye alſo ſtill void of underſtanding? Do ye not yet apprehend, that whatever entereth the mouth, paſſeth into the belly,
11 and is thrown out into the ſink. But that which proceedeth out of
19 the mouth, iſſueth from the heart, and ſo polluteth the man. For out of the heart proceed malicious contrivances, murders, adulteries,

(t) In the Old Teſtament *Chinnereth.*

19 fornications, thefts, falſe teſtimonies, calumnies. Theſe are the things which pollute the man; but to eat with unwaſhen hands polluteth not the man.

21 *THEN Jeſus withdrew into the confines of Tyre and Sidon; and* Mar. 7; 24.
22 *behold! a Canaaniteſs woman of thoſe territories came to him, crying,* Maſter, Son of David, have pity upon me; my daughter is grievouſly
23 afflicted by a demon. *But he gave he her no anſwer. Then his diſciples interpoſed, and entreated him, ſaying,* Diſmiſs her, for ſhe
24 clamoureth after us. *He anſwering, ſaid,* My miſſion is only to the ch. 10; 6.
25 loſt ſheep of the ſtock of Iſrael. *She nevertheleſs advanced, and pro-*
26 *ſtrating herſelf before him, ſaid,* O Maſter, help me! *He replied,* It is not ſeemly to take the children's bread, and throw it to the dogs.
27 True, Sir, *returned ſhe,* yet even the dogs are allowed the crumbs
28 which fall from their maſter's table. *Then Jeſus anſwering, ſaid to her,* O woman! great is thy faith. Be it unto thee as thou deſireſt. *And that inſtant her daughter was healed.*
29 *Jeſus having left that place, came nigh the ſea of Galilee, and repaired*
30 *to a mountain, where he ſat down; and great multitudes flocked to him, bringing with them the lame, the blind, the dumb, the cripple, and ſeveral others [in diſtreſs], whom they laid at his feet; and he healed*
31 *them: inſomuch that the people beheld, with admiration, the dumb ſpeaking, the cripple ſound, the lame walking, and the blind ſeeing; and they glorified the God of Iſrael.* If. 35; 5.
32 *Then Jeſus called to him his diſciples, and ſaid,* I have compaſſion Mar. 8; 1.
on the multitude, becauſe they have now attended me three days, and have nothing to eat: I will not diſmiſs them faſting, leſt their ſtrength
33 fail by the way. *His diſciples anſwered,* Whence can we get bread
34 enough in this ſolitude to ſatisfy ſuch a crowd? *He aſked them,* How
35 many loaves have ye? *They ſaid,* Seven, and a few ſmall fiſhes. *Then*
36 *commanding the people to lie down upon the ground, he took the ſeven loaves and the fiſhes, and having given thanks divided them, and gave*
37 *them to his diſciples, who diſtributed them among the people. When all had partaken, and were ſatisfied, they carried off ſeven maunds of the*
38 *fragments that remained. Now they that had eaten were four thouſand men, beſide women and children.*
39 *Then having diſmiſſed the multitude, he embarked, and ſailed to the* Mar. 8; 11.
XVI. *coaſt of Magdala. Thither ſome Phariſees and Sadduces repaired,* Lu. 12; 54.
2 *who, to try him, deſired that he would ſhow them a ſign in the ſky. He anſwering, ſaid to them,* In the evening ye ſay, 'It will be fair weather;
3 'for the ſky is red;' and in the morning, 'There will be a ſtorm to-'day; for the ſky is red and lowering.' Ye can judge aright of the
4 appearance of the ſky, but cannot diſcern the ſigns of the times. An ch. 12; 39.

evil and adulterous race demandeth a ſign, but no ſign ſhall be given them, ſave the ſign of the Prophet Jonah. *Then leaving them, he departed.*

Mar. 8; 14. Lu. 12; 1. 5 *Now his diſciples, before they came over, had forgotten to bring loaves* 6 *with them. Jeſus ſaid to them,* Take heed, and beware of the leaven of 7 the Phariſees and of the Sadduces. *Whereupon they ſaid, reaſoning among themſelves,* This is becauſe we have brought no loaves with us. 8 *Jeſus perceiving it, ſaid to them,* What do ye reaſon amongſt your-ſelves, O ye diſtruſtful? That I ſpeak thus, becauſe ye have brought no ch. 14; 15. 9 loaves? Have ye no reflection? Or do ye not remember the five loaves among the five thouſand, and how many baſkets ye filled with the ch. 15; 32. 10 fragments? nor the ſeven loaves among the four thouſand, and how 11 many maunds ye filled? How is it that ye do not underſtand that I ſpake not concerning bread, when I bade you beware of the leaven 12 of the Phariſees and of the Sadduces? *Then they underſtood that he cautioned them not againſt the leaven which the Phariſees and the Sadduces uſed in bread, but againſt their doctrine.*

SECTION IX.

The Transfiguration.

Mar. 8; 27. Lu. 9; 18. 13 *AS Jeſus was going to the diſtrict of Ceſarea Philippi, he aſked his* 14 *diſciples, ſaying,* Who do men ſay that the Son of Man is? *They anſwered,* Some ſay, 'John the Baptiſt,' others, 'Elijah,' others, 15 'Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets.' But who, *returned he,* ſay ye Jo. 6; 69. 16 that I am? *Simon Peter anſwering, ſaid,* Thou art the Meſſiah, the 17 Son of the living God. *Jeſus replying, ſaid to him,* Happy art thou Simon Barjona (*u*); for fleſh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, Jo. 1; 42. 18 but my Father who is in heaven. I tell thee likewiſe, Thou art named Rock (*x*); and on this rock I will build my church, over 19 which the gates of hades ſhall not prevail. Moreover I will give thee ch. 18; 18. the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatever thou ſhalt bind upon Jo. 20; 23. the earth, ſhall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou ſhalt looſe 20 upon the earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven. *Then he forbade his diſciples to tell any man that he is the Meſſiah.*

ch. 17; 22. ch. 20; 17. Mar. 8; 31. & 9; 31. Lu. 9; 44. 21 *From that time Jeſus began to diſcover to his diſciples, that he muſt go to Jeruſalem, and there ſuffer much from the elders, and the chief prieſts, and the ſcribes, and be killed, and that he muſt be raiſed the* 22 *third day. On which Peter taking him aſide, reproved him, ſaying,* God

(*u*) Syr. *ſon of Jonas* (*x*) So *Peter* in Greek, and *Cephas* in Syr. ſignify.

23 God forbid, Maſter, this ſhall not befal thee. *But he turning ſaid to Peter*, Get thee hence, adverſary, thou art an obſtacle in my way; for thou reliſheſt not the things of God, but the things of men.

24 *Then ſaid Jeſus to his diſciples*, If any man will come under my guidance, let him renounce himſelf, and take up his croſs and follow 25 me. For whoſoever would ſave his life, ſhall loſe it; and whoſoever 26 will loſe his life for my ſake, ſhall find it. What is a man profited, if he ſhould gain the whole world, with the forfeit of his life? or 27 what will a man not give in ranſom for his life? For the Son of Man, veſted with his Father's glory, ſhall come hereafter with his angels, 28 and recompence every one according to his actions. Verily I ſay unto you, Some of thoſe who are preſent, ſhall not taſte death, until they ſee the Son of man enter upon his reign.

ch. 10; 38. Mar. 8; 34. Lu. 9; 23. 14; 27. & 17; 33. Jo. 12; 25. Ro. 2; 6. Rev. 22; 12. Mar. 9; 1. Lu. 9; 27.

XVII. *AFTER ſix days Jeſus took Peter, and James, and John brother* Mar. 9; 2.
2 *of James, apart to the top of a high mountain, and was transfigured in* Lu. 9; 28.
their preſence. His face ſhone as the ſun; and his raiment became white
3 *as the light. And preſently appeared to them Moſes and Elijah conver-*
4 *ſing with him. Peter upon this addreſſing Jeſus, ſaid*, Maſter, it is good for us to ſtay here; let us make here, if thou wilt, three booths, 2 Pet. 1; 17.
5 one for thee, and one for Moſes, and one for Elijah. *While he was* ch. 3; 17.
ſpeaking, behold! a bright cloud covered them, and out of the cloud came Mar. 1; 11.
a voice which ſaid, This is my beloved Son in whom I delight, hear Lu. 3; 22.
6 him. *The diſciples hearing this, fell upon their faces, and were greatly*
7 *frightened. But Jeſus came and touched them, ſaying*, Ariſe; be not
8 afraid. *Then lifting up their eyes, they ſaw none but Jeſus.*
9 *As they went down from the mountain, Jeſus commanded them, ſaying*, Mar. 9; 9.
Tell nobody what ye have ſeen, until the Son of Man be riſen from
10 the dead. *Then the diſciples aſked him, ſaying*, Why ſay the Scribes
11 that Elijah muſt come firſt? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them*, To
12 conſummate the whole, Elijah indeed muſt come firſt. But I tell ch. 11; 14.
you, Elijah is come already, though they did not acknowledge him, but have treated him as they pleaſed. Thus alſo they will treat the
13 Son of Man. *Then the diſciples underſtood that he ſpake concerning John the Baptiſt.*
14 *When they were come to the multitude, a man came to him, who kneeling*, Mar. 9; 14.
15 *ſaid*, Sir, have pity on my ſon; for he is grievouſly diſtreſſed with Lu. 9; 37.
16 lunacy; often he falleth into the fire, and often into the water, and I preſented him to thy diſciples; but they could not cure him.
17 *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid*, O unbelieving and perverſe race! How long ſhall I be with you? How long ſhall I ſuffer you? Bring him hither

to

18 to me. *Then Jeſus rebuked the demon, and he came out: and the lad was inſtantly cured.*

Mar. 9; 28. 19 *Hereupon the diſciples came to him privately, ſaying,* Why could
20 not we expel this demon? *Jeſus anſwered,* Becauſe of your unbelief;
Lu. 17; 6. for verily I ſay unto you, if ye had faith, though but as a grain of muſtard ſeed, ye might ſay to this mountain, Remove to yonder place, and it would remove: yea nothing would be impoſſible to
21 you. This kind, however, is not diſpoſſeſſed, unleſs by prayer and faſting.

ch. 16; 21. & 20; 18. Mar. 9; 31. Lu. 9; 44. 22 *While they remained in Galilee, Jeſus ſaid to them,* The Son of Man
23 is to be delivered to men who will kill him: but the third day he ſhall be raiſed again. *And they were grieved exceedingly.*

24 *When they were come to Capernaum, the collectors came and aſked*
25 *Peter,* Doth not your teacher pay the didrachma (*z*)? *He ſaid,* Yes. *Being come into the houſe, before he ſpoke, Jeſus ſaid to him,* What is thy opinion, Simon? From whom do the kings of the earth exact
26 tribute or cuſtom? From their own ſons, or from others? *Peter an-*
26 *ſwered,* From others. *Jeſus replied,* The ſons then are exempted. Nevertheleſs, leſt we ſhould give them offence, go to the ſea and
Mar. 9; 33. Lu. 9; 46. throw a line, draw out the firſt fiſh that is hooked, and, having opened its mouth, thou ſhalt find a ſtater (*a*), take that and give it
ch. 19; 14. them for me and thee.

XVIII. *At that time the diſciples came to Jeſus enquiring,* Who ſhall be
2 the greateſt in the reign of heaven? *Jeſus calling to him a child,*
3 *placed him in the midſt of them, and ſaid,* Verily I ſay unto you, unleſs ye be changed, and become as children, ye ſhall never enter
4 the kingdom of heaven. Whoſoever, therefore, ſhall become humble
5 like this child, ſhall be the greateſt in the reign of heaven. Nay,
Mar. 9; 42. Lu. 17; 1. 6 whoſoever receiveth one ſuch child in my name, receiveth me; but whoever ſhall enſnare any of theſe little ones who believe in me, it were better for him that an upper millſtone were hanged about his neck, and that he were ſunk in the ocean.

7 Woe unto the world becauſe of ſnares: ſnares indeed there muſt be;
ch. 5; 29. Mar. 9; 43. 8 nevertheleſs woe to the inſnarer. Wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot inſnare thee, cut it off and throw it away; it is better for thee to enter lame or maimed into life, than having two hands or two feet
9 to be caſt into the everlaſting fire. And if thine eye inſnare thee, pluck it out and throw it away; it is better for thee to enter one-eyed
10 into life, than having two eyes to be caſt into hell-fire. Beware of contemning any of theſe little ones; for I aſſure you that in heaven

(*z*) About 1s. 3d. ſterling. (*a*) Value *half a crown.*

11 their angels continually behold the face of my heavenly Father: and Lu. 19; 10.
12 the Son of Man is come to recover the loſt. What think ye? If Lu. 15; 4.
a man have a hundred ſheep, and one of them have ſtrayed; will he
not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains, and go in queſt of
13 the ſtray? And if he happen to find it, verily I ſay unto you, he
deriveth greater joy from it than from the ninety-nine which went
14 not aſtray. Thus it is not the will of your Father in heaven that any
of theſe little ones ſhould be loſt.

15 Wherefore, if thy brother treſpaſs againſt thee, go and expoſtulate Lev. 19; 17.
with him, when thou and he are alone together. If he hear thee, Ecc. 19; 13.
Lu. 17; 3.
16 thou haſt gained thy brother: but, if he will not hear, take one or Deut. 19; 15.
two along with thee, that by the teſtimony of two or three witneſſes, Jo. 8; 17.
17 every thing may be aſcertained. If he deſpiſe them, acquaint the 2 Co. 13; 1.
congregation with it; and if he deſpiſe the congregation alſo, let him be ch. 16; 19.
18 to thee as a pagan or a publican. Verily I ſay unto you; whatſoever Jo. 20; 23.
ye ſhall bind upon the earth, ſhall be bound in heaven; and whatſo-
ever ye ſhall looſe upon the earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven.

19 Again, I ſay unto you, whatever two of you upon the earth ſhall
agree to aſk, ſhall be granted them by my Father who is in heaven.
20 For whereſoever two or three are aſſembled in my name, I am in the
midſt of them.

21 *Then Peter approaching, ſaid to him*, Maſter, if my brother re- Lu. 17; 3.
peatedly treſpaſs againſt me; how often muſt I forgive him? Muſt I
22 ſeven times? *Jeſus anſwered*, I ſay not unto thee, Seven times, but
ſeventy times ſeven times.

23 In this the adminiſtration of heaven reſembleth that of a king who
24 determined to ſettle accounts with his ſervants. Having begun to
reckon, one was brought who owed him ten thouſand talents (*b*).
25 But that ſervant not having wherewith to pay; his maſter, to obtain
payment, commanded that he and his wife and children, and all that
26 he had, ſhould be ſold. Then the ſervant throwing himſelf proſtrate
before his maſter, cried, 'Have patience with me, my lord, and I
27 'will pay the whole.' And his maſter had compaſſion upon him, and
28 diſmiſſed him, remitting the debt. But this ſervant, as he went out,
meeting one of his fellow-ſervants who owed him a hundred denarii (*c*),
29 ſeized him by the throat, ſaying, 'Pay me what thou oweſt.' His
fellow-ſervant threw himſelf at his feet, and beſought him, ſaying,
30 'Have patience with me, and I will pay thee.' And he would not,
but inſtantly cauſed him to be impriſoned, until he ſhould diſcharge
31 the debt. His fellow-ſervants ſeeing this, were deeply affected, and

 went,

(*b*) Above three millions ſterling. (*c*) About three guineas.

32 went, and informed their maſter of all that had paſſed. Then his
maſter, having given orders to call him, said to him, 'Thou wicked
'servant: all that debt I forgave thee, becauſe thou beſoughteſt me.
33 'Oughteſt not thou to have ſhown ſuch pity to thy fellow-ſervant,
34 'as I ſhowed to thee?' So his maſter, being provoked, delivered him
to the jailors, to remain in their hands, until he ſhould clear the debt.
35 Thus will my celeſtial Father treat every one of you who forgiveth not
from his heart the faults of his brother.

SECTION X.

The rich Man's Application.

Mar. 10; 1. XIX. *WHEN Jeſus had ended this diſcourſe, he left Galilee, and came*
2 *into the confines of Judea upon the Jordan, whither great multi-*
tudes followed him, and he healed their ſick.

Mar. 10; 2. 3 *Then ſome Phariſees came to him, and trying him, aſked,* Can a man
Gen. 1; 27. 4 lawfully, upon every pretence, divorce his wife? *He anſwered,* Have
ye not read, that at the beginning, when the Creator made man, he
Gen. 2; 24. 5 formed a male and a female, and ſaid, "For this cauſe a man ſhall
1 Cor. 6; 16. "leave father and mother, and adhere to his wife, and they two
Eph. 5; 31. 6 "ſhall be one fleſh." Wherefore they are no longer two, but one
7 fleſh. What then God hath conjoined, let not man ſeparate. *They*
replied, Why then did Moſes command to give a writing or divorce-
Deut 24; 1. 8 ment, and diſmiſs her? *He anſwered,* Moſes indeed, becauſe of your
ch. 5; 31. untractable diſpoſition, permitted you to divorce your wives, but it
Lu. 6; 18. 9 was not ſo from the beginning. Therefore I ſay unto you, Whoever
divorceth his wife, except for whoredom, and marrieth another, com-
1 Cor. 7; 11. mitteth adultery: and whoever marrieth the woman divorced, com-
10 mitteth adultery. *His diſciples ſaid to him,* If ſuch be the condition
11 of the huſband, it is better to live unmarried. *He anſwered,* They
12 alone are capable of living thus, on whom the power is conferred. For
ſome are eunuchs from their birth; others have been made eunuchs by
men; and others, for the ſake of the kingdom of heaven, have made
themſelves eunuchs. Let him act this part who can act it.

Mar. 10; 13. 13 *Then children were preſented to him, that he might lay his hands*
Lu. 18; 15. *upon them, and pray [for them]; but the diſciples reproved [thoſe who*
ch. 18; 1. 14 *brought] them. Jeſus ſaid,* Let the children alone, and hinder them
not from coming unto me; for of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven.
15 *And having laid his hands on them he departed thence.*

Afterwards,

16 *Afterwards, one approaching, ſaid to him,* Good Teacher, what Mar. 10; 17.
17 good muſt I do to obtain eternal life? *He anſwered,* Why calleſt Lu. 18; 18.
thou me good? God alone is good. If thou wouldſt enter into that
18 life, keep the commandments. *He ſaid unto him,* Which? *Jeſus*
anſwered, "Thou ſhalt not commit murder. Thou ſhalt not com- Ex. 20; 12.
"mit adultery. Thou ſhalt not ſteal. Thou ſhalt not give falſe Deut. 5; 16.
19 "teſtimony. Honour thy father and mother; and love thy neighbour Lev. 19; 18.
20 "as thyſelf." *The young man replied,* All theſe I have obſerved from
21 my childhood. Wherein am I ſtill deficient? *Jeſus anſwered,* If thou
wouldſt be perfect, go ſell thy eſtate, and give the price to the
poor, and thou ſhalt have treaſure in heaven; then come and follow
22 me. *The young man hearing this, went away ſorrowful, for he had*
great poſſeſſions.
23 *Whereupon Jeſus ſaid to his diſciples,* Verily I ſay unto you, it is dif- Mar. 10; 23.
24 ficult for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven: I ſay further, Lu. 18; 24.
it is eaſier for a camel to paſs through the eye of a needle, than for a
25 rich man to enter the kindom of God. *His diſciples, who heard this*
26 *with amazement, ſaid,* Who then can be ſaved? *Jeſus looking at*
them anſwered, With men this is impoſſible; but with God every thing
is poſſible.
27 *Then Peter replying, ſaid,* As for us, we have forſaken all, and Mar 10; 28.
28 followed thee; what then ſhall be our reward? *Jeſus anſwered,* Lu. 18; 28.
Verily I ſay unto you, that at the renovation, when the Son of Man
ſhall be ſeated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, ſitting alſo
29 upon twelve thrones, ſhall judge the twelve tribes of Iſrael. And Lu. 22; 30.
whoſoever ſhall have forſaken, on my account, houſes, or brothers,
or ſiſters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, ſhall
receive a hundred-fold, and inherit eternal life.
30 But many ſhall be firſt that are laſt, and laſt that are firſt. Mar. 10; 31.
XX. For the adminiſtration of heaven will reſemble the conduct of a houſe- Lu. 13; 30.
holder, who went out early in the morning to hire labourers for his
2 vineyard. Having agreed with ſome for a denarius (*d*) a day, he
3 ſent them into his vineyard. About the third hour (*e*) he went out,
4 and ſeeing others unemployed in the market-place, ſaid to them, Go
ye likewiſe into my vineyard, and I will give you what is reaſonable.
5 Accordingly they went. Again, about the ſixth hour (*f*), and about
6 the ninth (*g*), he went out and did the ſame. Laſtly, about the
eleventh hour (*h*) he went out, and finding others unemployed, ſaid
7 to them, 'Why ſtand ye all the day here doing nothing?' They an-
ſwered, 'Becauſe nobody hath hired us.' He ſaid to them, 'Go ye
'alſo

(*d*) About 7½d. (*f*) Noon. (*h*) Five o'clock afternoon.
(*e*) Nine o'clock morning. (*g*) Three o'clock afternoon.

'alſo into my vineyard, and ye ſhall receive what is reaſonable.'
8 When it was night, the proprietor of the vineyard ſaid to his ſteward,
'Call the labourers, and pay them their wages, beginning with the
9 'laſt, and ending with the firſt.' Then they who had been hired, at
10 the eleventh hour came, and received each a denarius. When the firſt came, they imagined they ſhould get more; but they got only a
11 denarius a-piece. Upon receiving it, they murmured againſt the
12 houſeholder, ſaying, 'Theſe laſt have worked but one hour; yet thou haſt made them equal to us who have borne the burden and the
13 heat of the day.' He anſwering ſaid to one of them, 'Friend, I do
'thee no injury. Didſt not thou agree with me for a denarius?
14 'take what is thine, and depart. It is my will to give to this laſt as
15 'much as to thee. And may not I do what I will with mine own?
ch. 22; 14. 16 'Is thine eye evil, becauſe I am good?' Thus the laſt ſhall be firſt, and the firſt laſt; for there are many called, but few choſen.

SECTION XI.

The Entry into Jeruſalem.

Mar. 10; 32. 17 *WHEN Jeſus was on the road to Jeruſalem, he took the twelve*
Lu. 18; 31. 18 *diſciples aſide, and ſaid to them,* We are now going to Jeruſalem,
ch. 16; 21. & 17; 22. where the Son of man ſhall be delivered to the chief prieſts and the
19 ſcribes, who will condemn him to die, and conſign him to the Gentiles, to be mocked, and ſcourged, and crucified: but the third day he ſhall riſe again.

Mar. 01; 35. 20 *Then the mother of Zebedee's children came to him with her ſons, and, proſtrating herſelf, entreated he would grant the requeſt ſhe had to*
21 *make. He ſaid to her,* What wouldſt thou? *She anſwered,* That in thy reign one of theſe my two ſons may ſit at thy right hand, the
22 other at thy left. *Jeſus replying, ſaid,* Ye know not what ye aſk. Can ye drink ſuch a cup as I muſt drink; or undergo an immerſion like that which I muſt undergo? *They ſaid unto him,* We can.
23 *He anſwered,* Ye ſhall indeed drink ſuch a cup, and undergo an immerſion like that which I muſt undergo. But to ſit at my right hand and at my left I cannot give, unleſs to thoſe for whom it is prepared by my Father.

Mar. 10; 41. 24 *The ten hearing this were full of indignation againſt the two brothers;*
Lu. 22; 24. 25 *but Jeſus calling them to him, ſaid,* Ye know that the princes of the nations domineer over them, and the great exerciſe their authority
26 upon them. It muſt not be ſo amongſt you: on the contrary, whoſoever would become great amongſt you, let him be your ſervant;

and whoſoever would be chief amongſt you, let him be your ſlave:
28 even as the Son of Man came not to be ſerved, but to ſerve, and to Phil. 2; 7.
give his life a ranſom for many.
29 *As they left Jericho followed by a great multitude, two blind men,* Mar. 10; 46.
who ſat by the way-ſide, hearing that Jeſus paſſed by, cried, ſaying, Lu. 18; 35.
31 Maſter, Son of David, have pity upon us. *The multitude charged them*
to be ſilent; but they cried the louder, ſaying, Maſter, Son of David,
32 have pity upon us. *Then Jeſus ſtopping called them, and ſaid,* What
33 do ye want me to do for you? *They anſwered,* Sir, to make us ſee.
Jeſus had compaſſion and touched their eyes. Immediately they received
ſight and followed him.

XXI. *When they were nigh Jeruſalem, being come to Bethphage, near the* Mar. 11; 1.
2 *Mount of Olives, Jeſus ſent two of his diſciples, ſaying,* Go to the Lu. 19; 29.
village oppoſite to you, where ye will immediately find an aſs tied,
3 and her colt with her; looſe them and bring them hither. If any man
ſay aught unto you, ſay, 'The Maſter wanteth them,' and he will
4 ſend them directly. *Now all this was done that the words of the*
5 *Prophet might be fulfilled,* "*Say to the daughter of Zion, Behold thy* Iſ. 62; 11.
"*King cometh to thee lowly, riding on an aſs, even the colt of a labour-* Zech. 9; 9.
6 "*ing beaſt.*" *Accordingly the diſciples went, and having done as Jeſus* Jo. 12; 15.
7 *had commanded them, brought the aſs and the colt, and covering them*
8 *with their mantles, made him ride. Now the greater part ſpread their*
mantles in the way; others lopped branches off the trees, and ſtrowed
9 *them in the way, while the crowd that went before, and that followed,*
ſhouted, ſaying, Hoſanna (*i*) to the Son of David; bleſſed be he that Pſ. 118; 25.
cometh in the name of the Lord (*k*). Hoſanna in the higheſt heaven.
10 *When he entered Jeruſalem, the whole city was in an uproar, every body*
11 *aſking,* Who is this? *The crowd anſwered,* It is Jeſus the Prophet
of Nazareth in Galilee.
12 *Then Jeſus went into the temple of God, and drove thence all who* Jo. 2; 14.
ſold and who bought in the temple, and overturned the tables of the Mar. 11; 15.
13 *money-changers, and the ſtalls of thoſe who ſold doves, and ſaid to them,* Lu. 19; 45.
It is written, "My houſe ſhall be called a houſe of prayer, and ye Iſ. 56; 7.
14 "have made it a den of robbers." *Then the blind and the lame came* Jer. 7; 11.
15 *to him in the temple, and he healed them. But the chief prieſts and* Lu. 19; 38,
the ſcribes, ſeeing the wonders which he performed, and the boys crying 39 & 46.
in the temple, Hoſanna to the Son of David, ſaid to him with indigna-
16 *tion,* Heareſt thou what theſe ſay? *Jeſus anſwered,* Yes. Have ye Pſ. 8; 2.
never read, "From the mouth of infants and ſucklings thou haſt pro-
17 cured praiſe." *Thereupon leaving them he went out of the city to Be-*
thany, where he remained that night.

(*i*) *Save now I pray.* (*k*) In Heb. *Jehovah.*

Mar. 11; 12. and 20. 18 *Returning to the city in the morning he was hungry, and ſeeing a ſingle fig-tree by the road, he went to it; but finding only leaves on it, ſaid,* Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward. *And the fig-tree*
20 *withered forthwith. When the diſciples ſaw it, they ſaid with aſtoniſh-*
Mar. 11; 22. 21 *ment,* How ſoon is the fig-tree withered! *Jeſus anſwered,* Verily I ſay unto you, if ye have an unſhaken faith, ye may not only do as much as is done to the fig-tree, but even if ye ſhould ſay to this mountain, 'Be lifted and thrown into the ſea,' it ſhall be done.
22 Moreover ye ſhall obtain whatſoever ye ſhall with faith pray for.

Lu. 20; 1. Mar. 11; 28. 23 *Being come into the temple, the chief prieſts and the elders of the peo-*
ple came near, as he was teaching, and ſaid, By what authority doſt
24 thou theſe things? and who empowered thee? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid to them,* I alſo have a queſtion to propoſe, which, if ye anſwer me,
25 I will tell you by what authority I do theſe things. Whence had John authority to baptize? From heaven; or from men? *Then they reaſoned thus within themſelves, 'If we ſay, From heaven, he will*
ch. 14; 5. 26 *'retort, Why then did ye not believe him? And if we ſay, From men,*
'we dread the multitude, amongſt whom John is univerſally accounted a
27 *prophet.' They therefore anſwered him,* We cannot tell. *Jeſus replied,* Neither tell I you by what authority I do theſe things.
28 But what think ye of this? A man had two ſons, and addreſſing
29 his elder ſon, ſaid, 'Son, go to work to-day in my vineyard.' He
30 anſwered, 'I will not,' but afterwards repented and went. Then addreſſing the younger, he bade him likewiſe. He anſwered, 'Im-
31 mediately, Sir,' but went not. Now, which of the two obeyed his father? *They ſaid,* The firſt. *Jeſus replied,* Verily I ſay unto you,
ch. 11; 18. even the publicans and the harlots ſhow you the way into the king-
Lu. 7; 33. 32 dom of God. For John came to you in the way of ſanctity, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him: yet ye who ſaw this, did not afterwards repent and believe him.

Mar. 12; 1. Lu. 20; 9. 33 Hear another parable: A certain landlord planted a vineyard, and hedged it round, and digged a wine-preſs in it, and built a tower;
34 and having farmed it out, went abroad. When the vintage approached,
35 he ſent his ſervants to the huſbandmen, to receive the fruits. But they ſeized his ſervants, beat one, drove away with ſtones another,
36 and killed another. Again, he ſent other ſervants in greater number;
37 but they received the ſame treatment. Finally, he ſent his ſon to
38 them; for he ſaid, 'They will reverence my ſon.' But when the huſbandmen ſaw the ſon, they ſaid among themſelves, 'This is the 'heir, come, let us kill him, and keep poſſeſſion of his inheritance.'
39 Then they ſeized him, thruſt him out of the vineyard, and killed him.
40 When, therefore, the proprietor of the vineyard cometh, what will
41 he do to thoſe huſbandmen? *They anſwered,* He will put thoſe wretches

to

to a wretched death, and will let the vineyard to others who will render him the fruits in the ſeaſon.

42 *Jeſus replied,* Did ye never read in the Scriptures, "A ſtone which "the builders rejected, is made the head of the corner. This the 43 Lord (*l*) hath effected, and we behold it with admiration." Know, therefore, that the kingdom of God ſhall be taken from you, and 44 given to a nation who will produce the fruits thereof. For whoſoever ſhall fall on this ſtone ſhall be bruiſed; but on whomſoever it ſhall fall, it will cruſh him to pieces. Pſ. 118; 22. Acts, 4; 11. 1 Pet. 2; 6.

45 *The chief prieſts and the Phariſees hearing his parables, perceived* 46 *that he ſpoke of them; but though they wiſhed to lay hold on him, they were afraid of the populace, who reckoned him a Prophet.*

XXII. *Jeſus continuing to diſcourſe to them in parables, ſaid,* The adminiſtration of heaven reſembleth the conduct of a king, who having 3 made a marriage-feaſt for his ſon, ſent his ſervants to call them who 4 had been invited; but they would not come. Then he ſent other ſervants, ſaying, 'Tell thoſe who are invited, I have prepared my 'feaſt, my bullocks and fatlings are ſlain, and all is ready, come to 5 'the marriage.' But they turned away with indifference, one to his 6 farm, another to his merchandiſe. And the reſt ſeizing his ſervants, 7 abuſed and killed them. When the king heard this, being enraged, he ſent his ſoldiers, deſtroyed thoſe murderers, and burnt their city. 8 Then he ſaid to his ſervants, 'The entertainment is ready; but they 9 'who were invited, were not worthy: go, therefore, into the public 10 'roads, and all that ye find, invite to the marriage.' Accordingly they went into the highways, and aſſembled all that they found, 11 good and bad, ſo that the hall was furniſhed with gueſts. When the king came in to ſee the gueſts, obſerving one who had not on a wed- 12 ding-garment, he ſaid to him, 'Friend, how cameſt thou hither, with- 13 out a wedding-garment?' And he was ſpeechleſs. Then the king ſaid to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and thruſt him out into 14 'darkneſs, where will be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth;' for there are many called, but few choſen. Lu. 14; 16. Rev. 19; 9. ch. 20; 16.

SECTION

(*l*) *Jehovah.*

SECTION XII.

The Character of the Phariſees.

Mar. 12; 13. Lu. 20; 20. 15 *THEN the Phariſees retired, and having conſulted how they might*
16 *entrap him in his words, ſent to him ſome of their diſciples, and ſome Herodians (m), who being inſtructed by them, ſaid,* Rabbi, we know that thou art ſincere, and faithfully teacheſt the way of God, without any partiality, for thou reſpecteſt not the perſon of men.
17 Tell us, therefore, thy opinion: Is it lawful to give tribute to Ceſar,
18 or not? *Jeſus perceiving their malice, ſaid,* Diſſemblers, why would
19 ye entangle me? Show me the tribute money. *And they reached him*
20 *a denarius (n). He aſked them,* Whoſe image and inſcription is this?
21 *They anſwered,* Ceſar's. *He replied,* Render, then, to Ceſar, that
22 which is Ceſar's, and to God that which is God's. *And admiring his anſwer, they left him, and went away.*

Mar. 12; 18. Lu. 20; 27. Acts, 23; 8. Deut. 25; 5. 23 *The ſame day came Sadduces to him, who ſay that there is no future*
24 *life, and thus addreſſed him,* Rabbi, Moſes hath ſaid, 'If one die, and have no children, his brother ſhall marry his widow, and raiſe iſſue
25 to the deceaſed.' Now there lived amongſt us ſeven brothers; the eldeſt married, and died without iſſue, leaving his wife to his brother.
26 Thus alſo the ſecond, and the third, and ſo to the ſeventh. Laſt of
28 all the woman died alſo. Now, at the reſurrection, whoſe wife ſhall
29 ſhe be of the ſeven; for they all married her? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them,* Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of
30 God; for in that ſtate, they neither marry, nor give in marriage;
31 they reſemble God's heavenly meſſengers. But as to the quickening of the dead, have ye not read what God declared to you, ſaying,
Ex. 3; 6. 32 "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God
33 "of Jacob." God is not a God of the dead, but of the living. *Now the people who heard this were amazed at his doctrine.*

Mar. 12; 28. Lu. 10; 25. 34 *Meantime, the Phariſees hearing that he had ſilenced the Sadduces,*
35 *flocked about him. Then one of them, a lawyer, trying him, propoſed*
36 *this queſtion,* Rabbi, which is the greateſt commandment in the law?
Deut. 6; 5. 37 *Jeſus anſwered,* "Thou ſhalt love the Lord (*o*) thy God with all
38 "thy heart, and with all thy ſoul, and with all thy mind." This is
Lev. 19; 18. 39 the firſt and greateſt commandment. The ſecond is like it, "Thou
40 "ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf." On theſe two commandments the whole law and the Prophets depend.

(*m*) *Partizans of Herod.* (*n*) A Roman coin, value ſeven-pence halfpenny. (*o*) *Jehovah.*

41 · *While the Phariſees were aſſembled, Jeſus aſked them, ſaying,* What think ye of the Meſſiah? Whoſe Son ſhould he be? *They anſwered,* David's. 43 *He replied,* How then doth David, ſpeaking by inſpiration, call him his Lord? 44 "The Lord (*p*)," ſaith he, "ſaid to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footſtool." 45 If the Meſſiah were David's Son, would David call him his Lord? 46 *To this none of them could anſwer; and from that day nobody preſumed to try him with queſtions.* Mar. 12; 35. Lu. 20; 41. Pſ. 110; 1.

XXIII · *Then Jeſus addreſſed the people and his diſciples, ſaying,* The Scribes and the Phariſees ſit in Moſes' chair; 3 therefore obſerve and do whatſoever they enjoin you: nevertheleſs follow not their example; for they ſay, and do not. 4 Heavy and intolerable burdens they prepare for other men's ſhoulder's, burdens which they themſelves will not put a finger to. 5 But whatever they do, they do to be obſerved by men. For this they wear broader phylacteries (*q*) than others, and larger tufts on their mantles; 6 and affect the uppermoſt places at entertainments, and the principal ſeats in the ſynagogues, and to be ſaluted in public places; 7 and to hear men addreſſing them, cry, 'Rabbi, Rabbi.' 8 But as for you, aſſume not the title of Rabbi; for ye have only one teacher, the Meſſiah: and ſtyle no man upon the earth your father, for he alone is your father who is in heaven; 9 and all ye are brethren. 10 Neither aſſume the title of leaders; for ye have only one leader, the Meſſiah. 11 The greateſt of you, on the contrary, ſhall be your ſervant; 12 for whoſoever will exalt himſelf, ſhall be humbled; and whoſoever will humble himſelf, ſhall be exalted. Lu. 11; 46. Acts. 15; 10. Num. 15; 38. Deut. 6; 8. and 22; 12. Mar. 12; 38. Lu. 11; 43. and 20; 46. Lu. 14; 11. and 18; 14.

13 But woe unto you Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye ſhut up the kingdom of heaven againſt men; and will neither enter yourſelves, nor permit others that would, to enter. Lu. 11; 52.

14 Woe unto you Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye devour the families of widows; nay, and uſe long prayers for a diſguiſe. This will but aggravate your puniſhment. Lu. 20; 47.

15 Woe unto you Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye traverſe ſea and land to make one proſelyte (*r*); and when he is gained, ye make him a ſon of hell doubly more than yourſelves.

16 Woe unto you, blind guides, who ſay, 'To ſwear by the temple 'bindeth not, but to ſwear by the gold of the temple is binding.' 17 Fooliſh and blind! which is more ſacred, the gold, or the temple 18 that conſecrateth the gold? and 'To ſwear by the altar bindeth not; 19 'but to ſwear by the offering that is upon it is binding.' Fooliſh and blind! which is more ſacred, the offering, or the altar that conſecrateth

(*p*) *Jehovah.*
(*q*) Scrips of parchment, containing ſentences of the law.
(*r*) A convert to Judaiſm.

20 ſecrateth the offering? Whoever, therefore, ſweareth by the altar, ſwear-
21 eth by it, and by every thing thereon. And whoever ſweareth by the
22 temple, ſweareth by it, and by him who dwelleth therein; and who-
ever ſweareth by heaven, ſweareth by the throne of God, and by Him
who ſitteth thereon.

Lu. 11; 42. 23 Woe unto you, Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye pay
the tithe of mint, dill, and cummin, and omit the more important
articles of the law, juſtice, humanity, and fidelity. Theſe ye ought
24 to have practiſed, without omitting thoſe. Blind guides! who ſtrain
your liquor to avoid ſwallowing a gnat; yet ſwallow a camel.

Lu. 11; 39. 25 Woe unto you, Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye
cleanſe the outſide of thoſe cups and platters, which within are laden
26 with rapine and iniquity. Blind Phariſee! begin with cleanſing the
inſide of the cup, and of the platter, if ye would make even the out-
ſide clean.

27 Woe unto you, Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye reſem-
ble whitened ſepulchres, which without indeed are beautiful, but with-
28 in are full of corruption, and of dead men's bones. Thus ye alſo out-
wardly appear righteous to men; but are inwardly fraught with ſub-
tilty and injuſtice.

Lu. 11; 47. 29 Woe unto you, Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye build
the ſepulchres of the Prophets, and adorn the monuments of the
30 righteous, and ſay, 'Had we lived in the days of our fathers, we
'would not have been their accomplices in the ſlaughter of the Pro-
31 'phets.' Thus ye teſtify againſt yourſelves, that ye are the ſons of
32 thoſe who murdered the Prophets. Fill ye up then the meaſure of
33 your fathers. Ah! ſerpents, offspring of vipers! How can ye eſcape
the puniſhment of hell?

Lu. 11; 49. 34 Therefore I ſend you Prophets, and wiſe men, and Scribes. Some
of them ye will kill and crucify; others ye will ſcourge in your ſyna-
35 gogues and baniſh from city to city; ſo that all the innocent blood
ſhed upon the earth ſhall be charged upon you, from the blood of
Gen. 4; 8. righteous Abel, to the blood of Zechariah ſon of Barachiah whom ye
2 Chr. 24; 20. 36 ſlew between the altar and the ſanctuary. Verily I ſay unto you, all
ſhall be charged upon this generation.

Lu. 13; 34. 37 O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem! that killeſt the Prophets, and ſtoneſt
them whom God ſendeth to thee; how often would I have gathered
thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings,
38 but ye would not. Quickly ſhall your habitation be transformed into
39 a deſert: for know that ye ſhall not henceforth ſee me, until ye ſay,
Pſ. 118; 26. 'Bleſſed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord (s).'

SECTION

(s) Jehovah.

SECTION XIII.

The Prophecy on Mount Olivet.

XXIV. 1 *AS Jeſus walked out of the temple, his diſciples came and made* Mar. 13; 1.
2 *him obſerve the buildings of it. Jeſus ſaid to them,* All this Lu. 21; 5.
ye ſee; verily I ſay unto you, one ſtone ſhall not be left here upon Lu. 19; 44.
another. All ſhall be razed.

3 *As he ſat upon the Mount of Olives, his diſciples accoſted him pri-* Mar. 13; 3.
vately, ſaying, Tell us, when will this happen? and what will be Lu. 21; 7.
4 the ſign of thy coming, and of the concluſion of this ſtate? *Jeſus an-*
5 *ſwering, ſaid to them,* Take heed that no man ſeduce you: for many
will aſſume my character, ſaying, 'I am the Meſſiah,' and will
6 ſeduce many. Nay, ye ſhall hear of wars, and rumours of wars; but
take care that ye be not alarmed: for all theſe things muſt happen;
but the end is not yet.

7 For nation will ariſe againſt nation, and kingdom againſt kingdom; Mar. 13; 8.
and there ſhall be famines and peſtilences, and earthquakes in ſundry Lu. 21; 10.
8 places. Yet theſe are but the prelude of woes. For they will con- ch. 10; 17.
ſign you to torments and to death; and ye ſhall be hated by all nations Jo. 16; 2.
10 on my account. Then many will be inſnared, and will betray their
11 fellows, and hate them. And many falſe prophets will ariſe who
12 ſhall ſeduce many. And becauſe vice will abound, the love of the
13 greater number will cool. But the man who perſevereth to the end
14 ſhall be ſaved. And this good tidings of the reign ſhall be publiſhed
through all the world, for the information of all nations. And then
ſhall come the end.

15 When, therefore, ye ſhall ſee on holy ground, the deſolating Mar. 13; 14.
abomination foretold by the Prophet Daniel *(Reader attend!)* then Lu. 21; 20.
16 let thoſe in Judea flee to the mountains; let not him who ſhall be Dan. 9; 26.
17 upon the houſe-top, come down to carry things out of his houſe; and
19 let not him who ſhall be in the field, return to take his mantle. But
woe unto the women with child, and unto them that give ſuck in thoſe
20 days. Pray therefore that your flight happen not in the winter, nor
21 on the Sabbath; becauſe there ſhall be then ſo great tribulation, as hath
not been ſince the beginning of the world until now, nor ſhall be ever
22 after. For if the time were protracted, no ſoul could ſurvive; but
for the ſake of the elect, the time ſhall be ſhort.

23 If any ſhall ſay to you then, 'Lo! the Meſſiah is here, or he is Mar. 13; 21.
24 'there,' believe it not: for falſe meſſiahs and falſe prophets will ariſe, Lu. 17, 23.
who will perform great wonders and prodigies, ſo as to ſeduce, if
poſſible,

25 poſſible, the elect themſelves. Remember I have warned you.
26 Wherefore, if they cry, 'He is in the deſart,' go not out; 'he is in
27 'the cloſet.' believe it not. For the coming of the Son of Man ſhall be like the lightning, which breaking forth from the eaſt, ſhineth
Lu. 17; 37. 28 even unto the weſt. For whereſoever the carcaſe is, the eagles will be gathered together.
Mar. 13; 24. 29 Immediately after thoſe days of affliction, the ſun ſhall be darkened,
Lu. 21; 25. and the moon ſhall with-hold her light; and the ſtars ſhall fall from
If. 13; 10. 30 heaven, and the heavenly powers ſhall be ſhaken. Then ſhall appear
Ezek. 32; 7. the ſign of the Son of Man in heaven; and all the tribes of the land
Joel, 2; 31. ſhall mourn, when they ſhall ſee the Son of Man coming on the
Rev. 1; 7. 31 clouds of heaven with great majeſty and power. And he will ſend his meſſengers with a loud-ſounding trumpet, who ſhall aſſemble his elect from the four quarters of the earth, from one extremity of the world to the other.
Mar. 13; 28. 32 Learn now a ſimilitude from the fig-tree. When its branches become tender, and put forth leaves, ye know that ſummer is nigh.
Lu. 21; 29. 33 In like manner, when ye ſhall ſee all theſe things; know that he is
34 near, even at the door. Verily I ſay unto you, this generation ſhall
35 not paſs until all theſe things happen. Heaven and earth ſhall fail;
36 but my words ſhall never fail. But of that day and that hour knoweth none but my Father, no not the heavenly meſſengers.
Lu. 17; 26. 37 Now that which happened in Noah's time, will alſo happen at the
38 coming of the Son of Man. For as in the days before the flood, even to that day that Noah entered the ark, they were eating and drinking
39 and marrying, and ſuſpected nothing until the flood came and ſwept them all away: ſo ſhall it alſo be at the coming of the Son of Man.
Lu. 17; 35. 40 Two men ſhall be in the field; one ſhall be taken, and one ſhall
41 eſcape. Two women ſhall be grinding at the mill; one ſhall be taken, and one ſhall eſcape.
Mar. 13; 32. 42 Watch, therefore, ſince ye know not at what hour your Maſter
ch. 25; 13. Lu. 12; 39. 43 will come. Ye are ſure that if the houſeholder knew at what time
1 Th. 5, 2. of the night the thief would come, he would watch and not ſuffer
Rev. 3; 3. & 16; 15. 44 him to break into his houſe. Be ye therefore always prepared; becauſe the Son of Man will come at an hour when ye are not expecting him.
45 Who now is the diſcreet and faithful ſervant, whom his maſter hath ſet over his houſehold, to diſpence to them regularly their allow-
46 ance? Happy that ſervant, if his maſter, at his return, ſhall find him
47 ſo employed. Verily I ſay unto you, he will entruſt him with the
48 management of all his eſtate. But as to the vicious ſervant, who
49 ſhall ſay within himſelf, 'My maſter deferreth his return,' and ſhall preſume to beat his fellow-ſervants, and to feaſt and carouſe with

 drunkards;

50 drunkards; the maſter of that ſervant will come on a day when he
51 is not expecting him, and at an hour he is not appriſed of, and having diſcarded him, will aſſign him his portion with the perfidious. Weeping and gnaſhing of teeth ſhall be there.

XXV. Then may the kingdom of heaven be compared to ten virgins,
2 who went out with their lamps to meet the bridegroom. Of theſe
3 five were prudent, and five fooliſh. The fooliſh took their lamps,
4 but carried no oil with them. But the prudent, beſide their lamps,
5 carried oil in their veſſels. While the bridegroom tarried, they all
6 became drowſy and fell aſleep. And at midnight a cry was raiſed:
7 'The bridegroom is coming, go out and meet him.' Then all the
8 virgins aroſe and trimmed their lamps. And the fooliſh ſaid to the
9 prudent, 'Give us of your oil; for our lamps are going out.' But the prudent anſwered, ſaying, 'Leſt there be not enough for us and
10 'you, go rather to them who ſell, and buy for yourſelves.' While they went to buy, the bridegroom came, and thoſe who were ready,
11 went in with him to the marriage, and the door was ſhut. Afterwards came alſo the other virgins, ſaying, 'Maſter, maſter, open
12 'unto us. He anſwered, 'Verily I ſay unto you, I know you not.'
13 Watch, therefore, becauſe ye know neither the day nor the hour. ch. 24; 42.
14 For the Son of Man is like one who, intending to travel, called his Mar. 13; 32.
15 ſervants, and committed to them his ſtock; to one he gave five talents (*t*), to another two, and to another one; to each according to
16 his reſpective ability, and immediately ſet out. Then he who had received the five talents, went and traded with them, and gained other
17 five. Likewiſe he who had received two, gained other two. Whereas he who had received but one, digged a hole in the ground, and hid
19 his maſter's money. After a long time, their maſter returned and
20 reckoned with them. Then he who had received the five talents, came and preſented other five, ſaying, 'Sir, thou deliveredſt to me 'five talents; here they are, and other five which I have gained.'
21 His maſter anſwered, 'Well done, good and faithful ſervant, thou 'haſt been faithful in a ſmall matter, I will give thee a more important
22 'truſt. Partake thou in thy maſter's joy.' He alſo who had received the two talents advancing, ſaid, 'Sir, thou deliveredſt to me two
23 'talents. Here they are, and other two which I have gained.' His maſter anſwered, 'Well done, good and faithful ſervant, thou haſt been 'faithful in a ſmall matter, I will give thee a more important truſt.
24 Partake thou in thy maſter's joy.' Then came he alſo who had received Lu. 19; 20.
the ſingle talent, and ſaid, 'Sir, I know that thou art a ſevere man, 'reaping where thou haſt not ſown, and gathering where thou haſt

(*t*) A talent thought to be equal to 187 l. 10 s. ſterling.

25 'not ſcattered; being therefore afraid, I hid thy talent under ground;
26 'but now I reſtore thee thine own.' His maſter anſwering, ſaid unto
'him, Malignant and ſlothful ſervant, didſt thou know that I reap where
27 'I have not ſown, and gather where I have not ſcattered? Shouldſt
'thou not then have given my money to the bankers, that, at my
ch. 13; 12. 28 'return, I might have received it with intereſt? Take from him,
Mar. 4; 25. 29 'therefore, the talent, and give it to him who hath ten: for to every
Lu. 8; 18. & 19; 26. 'one that hath, more ſhall be given, and he ſhall abound; but from
30 'him that hath not, even that which he hath ſhall be taken. And
'thruſt out this unprofitable ſervant into darkneſs, were ſhall be weep-
'ing and gnaſhing of teeth.'

31 Now when the Son of Man ſhall come in his glory, accompanied
by all the holy angels, and ſhall be ſeated upon his glorious throne;
32 then ſhall all the nations be aſſembled before him; and out of them
he will ſeparate the good from the bad, as a ſhepherd ſeparateth the
33 ſheep from the goats. The ſheep he will ſet at his right hand, and
the goats at his left.

34 Then will the king ſay to thoſe at his right hand, 'Come, ye bleſſed
'of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the forma-
Iſ. 58; 7. 35 'tion of the world; for I was hungry and ye gave me food; I was
Ezek. 18; 7. 'thirſty, and ye gave drink; I was a ſtranger, and ye lodged me;
36 'I was naked, and ye cloathed me; I was ſick, and ye aſſiſted me;
37 'I was in priſon, and ye viſited me.' Then the righteous will anſwer
him, ſaying, 'Lord, when did we ſee thee hungry, and fed thee;
38 'or thirſty, and gave thee drink? When did we ſee thee a ſtranger,
39 'and lodged thee; or naked, and clothed thee? When did we ſee
40 'thee ſick, or in priſon, and viſited thee?' The king will reply to
them, 'Verily I ſay unto you, that inaſmuch as ye have done this to
'any the leaſt of theſe my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

ch. 7; 23. 41 Then he will ſay to thoſe at his left hand, 'Depart from me, ye
Lu. 13; 27. 'curſed, into the eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;
42 'for I was hungry, but ye gave me no food; I was thirſty, but ye
43 'gave me no drink; I was a ſtranger, but ye did not lodge me;
'naked, but ye did not clothe me; ſick, and in priſon, but ye did
44 'not mind me.' Then they alſo will anſwer, ſaying, 'Lord, when
'did we ſee thee hungry, or thirſty, or a ſtranger, or naked, or ſick,
45 'or in priſon, and did not aſſiſt thee?' Then he will reply to them,
ſaying, 'Verily I ſay unto you, that inaſmuch as ye did it not to any
Jo. 5; 29. 46 'the leaſt of theſe, ye did it not to me.' And theſe ſhall go to eternal
Dan. 12; 2. puniſhment, but the righteous into eternal life.

SECTION

SECTION XIV.

The laſt Supper.

XXVI. *JESUS having ended this diſcourſe, ſaid to his diſciples,* Mar. 14; 1.
2 Ye know that two days hence cometh the paſſover. Then Lu. 22; 1.
3 the Son of Man ſhall be delivered up to be crucified. *About this time* Jo. 11; 47 & 53.
the chief prieſts and the Scribes, and the elders of the people, were con-
4 *vened in the palace of Caiaphas the high prieſt, where they conſulted*
5 *how they might take Jeſus by ſurprize, and kill him. They ſaid, however,* Not during the feſtival, leſt there be a commotion among the people.
6 *Now Jeſus being in Bethany, in the houſe of Simon [formerly] a* Mar. 14; 3.
7 *leper, a woman came to him with an alabaſter box of balſam, very precious,* Jo. 11; 2.
8 *which ſhe poured upon his head, while he was at table. His diſciples ob-* & 12; 2.
9 *ſerving it, ſaid, with indignation,* Why this profuſion? This balſam might have been ſold for a great price, and the money given to the
10 poor. *Jeſus knowing it, ſaid to them,* Why trouble ye the woman?
11 She hath done me a good office. For ye have the poor always amongſt Deut. 15; 11.
12 you: but me ye have not always. For it is to embalm me that ſhe
13 hath poured this balſam upon my body. Verily I ſay unto you, In what part ſoever of the world the goſpel ſhall be preached, what this woman hath now done ſhall be mentioned to her honour.
14 *Then one of the twelve, named Judas Iſcariot, went to the chief* Mar. 14; 10.
15 *prieſts, and ſaid,* What will ye give me, and I will deliver him to Lu. 22; 3.
16 you? *And they weighed to him thirty ſhekels (u). And from that time he watched an opportunity to deliver him up.*
17 *Now on the firſt day of unleavened bread, the diſciples came to Jeſus* Mar. 14; 12.
18 *ſaying,* Where ſhall we prepare for thee the paſchal ſupper? *He an-* Lu. 22; 7.
ſwered, Go into the city, to ſuch a man, and tell him, 'The teacher
'ſaith, My time is near; I muſt celebrate the paſſover at thy houſe
19 'with my diſciples.' *And the diſciples did as they were ordered, and prepared the paſſover.*
20 *In the evening he placed himſelf at table with the twelve; and while* Mar. 14; 17.
they were eating, he ſaid, Verily I ſay unto you, that one of you will Lu. 22; 21.
22 betray me. *And they were extremely ſorrowful, and began every one of* Jo. 13; 21. Pſ. 41; 9.
23 *them to ſay,* Maſter, is it I? *He anſwering, ſaid,* The man whoſe
24 hand is in the diſh with mine, is he who betrayeth me. The Son of Man departeth in the manner foretold in Scripture concerning him; but

(u) About 3 l. 15 s. ſterling.

but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it had
25 been better for that man never to have been born. *Then Judas, who betrayed him, ſaid alſo,* Rabbi, is it I? *Jeſus anſwered,* It is.

Mar. 14; 22. Lu. 22; 14. 1 Cor. 11; 23. 26 *As they were eating, Jeſus took the loaf, and, having given thanks, broke it, and gave it to the diſciples, and ſaid,* Take, eat, this is my
27 body. *Then he took the cup, and having given thanks, gave it to them,*
28 *ſaying,* Drink hereof all of you; for this is my blood, the blood of
29 the new covenant, ſhed for many, for the remiſſion of ſins. I aſſure you that I will not henceforth drink of the product of the vine, until the day when I ſhall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.
30 *And after the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives.*

Mar. 14; 27. Zec. 13; 7. Jo. 16; 32. Mar. 16; 7. Lu. 22; 31. Jo. 13; 37. 31 *Then Jeſus ſaid to them,* This night I ſhall prove a ſnare to you all; for it is written, "I will ſmite the ſhepherd, and the flock will diſ-
32 perſe." But after I am raiſed again, I will go before you into
33 Galilee. *Peter thereupon ſaid to him,* Though thou ſhouldeſt prove
34 a ſnare to them all: I never will be inſnared. *Jeſus anſwered,* Verily I ſay unto thee, that this very night, before the cock crow, thou wilt
35 thrice diſown me. *Peter replied,* Although I ſhould die with thee, I never will diſown thee. *And all the diſciples ſaid the ſame.*

Mar. 14; 32. Lu. 22; 40. 36 *Then Jeſus went with them to a place called Gethſemane, and ſaid to*
37 *his diſciples,* Stay here, while I go yonder and pray. *And he took with him Peter and the two ſons of Zebedee; and being oppreſſed with*
38 *grief, ſaid to them,* My ſoul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguiſh;
39 abide here, and watch with me. *And going a little before, he threw himſelf on his face, and praying, ſaid,* My Father, remove this cup from me, if it be poſſible; nevertheleſs, not as I would, but as thou
40 wilt. *And he returned to his diſciples, and finding them aſleep, ſaid to Peter,* Is it ſo then, that ye could not keep awake with me a ſingle
41 hour? Watch and pray, that ye be not overcome by temptation; the
42 ſpirit indeed is willing, but the fleſh is weak. *A ſecond time he withdrew, and prayed, ſaying,* O my Father, if there be no exemption for
43 me; if I muſt drink this cup, thy will be done. *Upon his return, he*
44 *again found them ſleeping, for their eyes were overpowered. Again, leaving them, he went and prayed the third time, uſing the ſame words.*
45 *Then he came back to his diſciples, and ſaid to them,* Sleep on now, and take your reſt: behold the hour approacheth, when the Son of Man
46 muſt be delivered into the hands of ſinners. Ariſe, let us be going; lo! he who betrayeth me is at hand.

Mar. 14; 43. Lu. 22; 47. Jo. 18; 3. 47 *Before he had done ſpeaking, Judas, one of the twelve, appeared with a great multitude, armed with ſwords and clubs, and ſent by the chief*
48 *prieſts and elders of the people. Now the betrayer had given them a ſign,*
49 *ſaying,* The man whom I ſhall kiſs is he, ſecure him. *And coming*
50 *directly to Jeſus, he ſaid,* Hail Rabbi, *and kiſſed him. Jeſus anſwered,*

 Friend,

Friend, for what purpoſe comeſt thou? *Then they advanced, and laying*
51 *hands on Jeſus ſeized him. Upon this one of Jeſus' company laying his*
hand upon his ſword, drew it; and ſtriking the ſervant of the high prieſt,
52 *cut off his ear. Jeſus ſaid to him,* Sheathe thy ſword; for whoever Gen. 9; 6.
53 hath recourſe to the ſword, ſhall fall by the ſword. Thinkeſt thou Rev. 13; 10.
that I cannot preſently invoke my Father, who would ſend to my re-
54 lief more than twelve legions of angels (*x*). But in that caſe how
ſhould the Scriptures be accompliſhed, which declare that theſe things
55 muſt be. *Then turning to the multitude, he ſaid,* Do ye come with
ſwords and clubs to apprehend me, like people in purſuit of a robber?
I ſat daily amongſt you, teaching in the temple, and ye did not arreſt
56 me. But all this hath happened, that the writings of the Prophets
might be fulfilled. *Then all the diſciples forſook him and fled.*

SECTION XV.

The Crucifixion.

57 *NOW they who had apprehended Jeſus, brought him to Caiaphas the* Mar. 14; 53.
58 *high prieſt, where the Scribes and the elders were aſſembled. But* Lu. 22; 54.
Peter followed him at a diſtance, to the court of the high prieſt's houſe, Jo. 18; 13. & 24.
and having gone in, ſat with the officers to ſee the iſſue.

59 *Meantime the chief prieſts and the elders, and the whole Sanhedrim* Mar. 14; 55.
ſought out falſe evidence againſt Jeſus, upon which they might condemn Lu. 22; 66.
60 *him to die. But though many falſe witneſſes appeared, they found it not.*
61 *At length came two falſe witneſſes, who charged him with ſaying,* 'I Jo. 2; 19.
62 'can demoliſh the temple of God, and rebuild it in three days.' *Then*
the high prieſt riſing, ſaid to him, Anſwereſt thou nothing to what
63 theſe men teſtify againſt thee? *Jeſus remaining ſilent, he added,* On
the part of the living God, I adjure thee to tell us, whether thou be
64 the Meſſiah, the Son of God. *Jeſus anſwered him,* It is as thou ſayeſt:
nay, be aſſured that hereafter ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man ſitting at
the right hand of the Almighty, and coming on the clouds of heaven.
65 *Then the high prieſt, rending his clothes, ſaid,* He hath uttered blaſ-
phemy. What further need have we of witneſſes, now that ye have
66 heard him blaſpheme? What think ye? *They anſwered,* He de- Is. 50; 6.
67 ſerveth to die. *Then they ſpat in his face. Some gave him blows on*
68 *the head, and others ſtruck him on the cheeks, and ſaid,* Divine to us,
Meſſiah, who it was that ſmote thee.

(*x*) A Roman legion conſiſted of 6000 men; ſometimes more, ſometimes fewer.

Mar. 14; 66. Lu. 22; 55. Jo. 18; 17. & 25.
69 *Now Peter was ſitting without in the court, and a maid ſervant came*
70 *to him, and ſaid,* Thou alſo waſt with Jeſus the Galilean. *But he*
71 *denied before them all, ſaying,* I know nothing of the matter. *And as he went out into the porch, another maid obſerving him, ſaid to them,*
72 This man too was there with Jeſus the Nazarene. *Again, he denied,*
73 *ſwearing that he knew him not. Soon after ſome of the byſtanders ſaid to Peter,* Thou art certainly one of them, for thy ſpeech diſcovereth thee.
74 *Whereupon, with execrations and oaths he aſſerted that he did not know*
ch. 26; 34. 75 *him; and immediately the cock crew. Then Peter remembered the word Which Jeſus had ſaid to him,* " *Before the cock crow, thou wilt thrice* " *diſown me.*" *And he went out and wept bitterly.*

Mar. 15; 1. Lu. 23; 1. Jo. 18; 28.
XXVII. *WHEN it was morning, all the chief prieſts and the elders of the people having conſulted againſt Jeſus, how they might procure his death,*
2 *conducted him bound to Pontius Pilate the procurator, to whom they conſigned him.*
3 *Then Judas, who had betrayed him, finding that he was condemned,*
repented; and returning the thirty ſhekels to the chief prieſts and the
4 *elders, ſaid,* I have ſinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent.
5 *They anſwered,* What is that to us? See thou to that. *After which, having thrown down the money in the temple, he went away and*
Acts, 1; 18. 6 *ſtrangled himſelf. The chief prieſts taking the money, ſaid,* It is not lawful to put it into the ſacred treaſury, becauſe it is the price of blood.
7 *But after deliberating, they bought with it the potter's field, to be a*
8 *burying place for ſtrangers; for which reaſon that field is to this day*
Zech. 11; 12. 9 *called the field of blood. Then was the word of Jeremiah the Prophet verified,* " *The thirty ſhekels, the ſtipulated price at which he was valued,*
10 " *I took, as the Lord (y) appointed me, from the ſons of Iſrael, who* " *gave them for the potter's field.*"

Mar. 15; 2. Lu. 23; 1.
11 *Now Jeſus appeared before the procurator, who queſtioned him, ſaying,* Thou art the King of the Jews? *He anſwered,* Thou ſayeſt right.
12 *But when he was arraigned by the chief prieſts and the elders, he made*
13 *no reply. Then Pilate ſaid to him,* Heareſt thou not of how many
14 crimes they accuſe thee? *But he anſwered not one word, which ſurpriſed the procurator exceedingly.*

Mar. 15; 6. Lu. 23; 17. Jo. 18; 39.
15 *Now the procurator was wont to releaſe, at the feſtival, any one of*
16 *of the priſoners whom the multitude demanded. And they had then a*
17 *famous priſoner named Barabbas. Therefore, when they were aſſembled, Pilate ſaid to them,* Whom ſhall I releaſe to you? Barabbas, or Jeſus
18 who is called Meſſiah?—*For he perceived that through envy they had delivered*

(y) Jehovah.

19 *delivered him up; beſides, while he was ſitting on the tribunal, his wife*
ſent him this meſſage, ' Have thou nothing to do with that innocent
' perſon, for to-day I have ſuffered much in a dream on his account.')
20 *But the chief prieſts and the elders inſtigated the populace to demand*
21 *Barabbas, and cauſe Jeſus to be executed. Therefore when the procu-*
rator aſked which of the two he ſhould releaſe, they all anſwered Barabbas.
22 *Pilate replied,* What then ſhall I do with Jeſus, whom they call Acts, 3; 14.
23 Meſſiah? *They all anſwered,* Let him be crucified. *The procurator*
ſaid, Why? what evil hath he done? *But they cried the louder, ſaying,*
24 Let him be crucified. *Pilate perceiving that he was ſo far from prevail-*
ing, that they grew more tumultuous, took water, and waſhed his hands be-
fore the multitude, ſaying, I am guiltleſs of the blood of this innocent
25 perſon. See ye to it. *And all the people anſwering ſaid,* His blood be
26 upon us and upon our children. *Then he releaſed Barabbas to them,*
and having cauſed Jeſus to be ſcourged, delivered him up to be crucified.
27 *After this the procurator's ſoldiers took Jeſus into the pretorium (z),* Mar. 15; 16.
28 *where they gathered around him all the band. And having ſtripped him,* Jo. 19; 1.
29 *they robed him in a ſcarlet cloak, and crowned him with a wreath of thorns,* Pſ. 22; 16.
and put a rod in his right hand, and kneeling before him in mockery, cried,
30 Hail, King of the Jews. *And ſpitting upon him, they took the rod,*
31 *and ſtruck him with it on the head. When they had mocked him, they*
diſrobed him again, and having put his own raiment on him, led him
away to crucify him.
32 *As they went out of the city, they met one Simon a Cyrenian, whom they* Mar. 15; 21.
33 *conſtrained to carry the croſs; and being arrived at a place called Golgo-* Lu. 23; 26.
34 *tha, which ſignifieth a place of ſkulls, they gave him to drink vinegar,* 33.
mixed with wormwood, which, having taſted it, he would not drink. Jo. 19; 17.
35 *After they had nailed him to the croſs, they parted his garments by lot;* Pſ. 22; 18.
[*thus verifying the words of the Prophet,* "*They ſhared my mantle among*
36 *them, and caſt lots for my veſture.*"] *And having ſat down there, they*
37 *guarded him. And over his head they placed this inſcription, denoting*
the cauſe of his death. THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE
38 *JEWS. Two robbers alſo were crucified with him, one at his right*
hand, the other at his left.
39 *Meanwhile the paſſengers reviled him, ſhaking their heads, and ſaying,* Mar. 15; 29.
40 Thou who demoliſheſt the temple, and rebuildeſt it in three days: Lu. 23; 35.
41 if thou be God's Son, come down from the croſs. *The chief prieſts* Jo. 2; 19.
alſo, with the ſcribes, the elders, and the Phariſees, deriding him, ſaid,
42 He ſaved others: cannot he ſave himſelf? If he be king of Iſrael, let Pſ. 22; 8.
43 him now deſcend from the croſs, and we will believe him. He truſt- Wiſ. 2; 16.
ed in God. Let God deliver him now, if he regard him; for he
called

(z) The governor's palace, or hall of audience.

44 called himſelf God's Son. *The robbers too, his fellow-ſufferers, upbraided him in the ſame manner.*

Mar. 15; 33. 45 *Now from the ſixth (a) hour to the ninth (b), the whole land was in*
Lu. 23; 44. 46 *darkneſs. About the ninth (c) hour Jeſus cried aloud, ſaying,* Eli, eli,
Pſ. 22; 1. lama ſabachthani! *that is,* "*My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken*
47 "*me?*" *Some of the byſtanders hearing this, ſaid,* He calleth Elijah.
48 *inſtantly one of them ran, fetched a ſponge and ſoaked it in vinegar, and*
49 *having faſtened it to a ſtick, preſented it to him to drink. The reſt ſaid,*
50 Forbear, we ſhall ſee whether Elijah will come to ſave him. *Jeſus having again cried with a loud voice, reſigned his ſpirit.*

Mar. 15; 38. 51 *And behold the veil of the temple was rent in two from top to bottom,*
Lu. 23; 45. 52 *the earth trembled, and the rocks ſplit. Graves alſo burſt open, and after his reſurrection, the bodies of ſeveral ſaints who ſlept were raiſed,*
came out of the graves, went into the holy city, and were ſeen by many.
54 *Now the centurion, and they who with him guarded Jeſus, obſerving the earthquake, and what paſſed, were exceedingly terrified, and ſaid,* This was certainly the Son of a God.

Mar. 15; 40. 55 *Several women alſo were there, looking on at a diſtance, who had*
Lu. 23; 55. 56 *followed Jeſus from Galilee, aſſiſting him with their ſervice. Among them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joſes, and the mother of Zebedee's ſons.*

SECTION XVI.

The Reſurrection.

Mar. 15; 42. 57 *IN the evening a rich Arimathean named Joſeph, who was himſelf a*
Lu. 23; 50. 58 *diſciple of Jeſus, went to Pilate and begged the body of Jeſus. Pilate*
Jo. 19; 38. 59 *having given orders to deliver it to Joſeph; he took the body, wrapped it in clean linen, and depoſited it in his own monument, which he had newly cauſed to be hewn in the rock; and having rolled a great ſtone to*
61 *the entrance, he went away. Now Mary Magdalene and the other Mary were there ſitting over againſt the ſepulchre.*

62 *On the morrow, being the day after the preparation (d), the chief*
63 *prieſts and the Phariſees repaired in a body to Pilate, and ſaid,* My lord, we remember that this impoſtor, when alive, ſaid, "Within three
64 "days I ſhall be raiſed." Command, therefore, that the ſepulchre be guarded for three days, leſt his diſciples come by night and ſteal him, and ſay to the people, 'He is raiſed from the dead;' for this

(a) Twelve o'clock, noon. (b) Three afternoon.
(c) Three afternoon. (d) With us *Friday*.

65 laſt impoſture would prove worſe than the firſt. *Pilate anſwered*, Ye
66 have a guard; make the ſepulchre as ſecure as ye can. *Accordingly they went and ſecured it, ſealing the ſtone and poſting guards.*

XXVIII. *SABBATH (e) being over, and the firſt day (f) of the week beginning to dawn, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to viſit* Mar. 16; 1. Jo. 20; 1.
2 *the ſepulchre. Now there had been a great earthquake; for a meſſenger of the Lord had deſcended from heaven, who, having rolled the ſtone*
3 *from the entrance, ſat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and*
4 *his apparel white as ſnow. Seeing him the guards quaked with ter-*
5 *ror, and became as dead men. But the angel ſaid to the women*, Fear
6 not ye; for I know that ye ſeek Jeſus who was crucified. He is not here; for he is riſen, as he foretold. Come, ſee the place where the
7 Lord lay. And go quickly, ſay to his diſciples, 'He is riſen from 'the dead; behold he goeth before you to Galilee, where ye ſhall ſee 'him.' Take notice; I have told you.
8 *Inſtantly they went out from the monument with fear and great joy,*
9 *and ran to inform his diſciples. When they were gone, Jeſus himſelf met them, ſaying*, Rejoice. *Upon which they proſtrated themſelves*
10 *before him, and embraced his feet. Then Jeſus ſaid to them*, Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren to repair to Galilee, and there they ſhall ſee me.
11 *They were no ſooner gone than ſome of the guard went into the city,*
12 *and informed the chief prieſts of all that had happened. Theſe after meeting and conſulting with the elders, gave a large ſum to the ſoldiers*
13 *with this injunction*, Say, 'His diſciples came by night and ſtole him
14 'while we were aſleep.' And if this come to the procurator's ears,
15 we will appeaſe him and indemnify you. *So they took the money and acted agreeably to their inſtructions. Accordingly this report is current among the Jews to this day.*
16 *Now the eleven diſciples went to Galilee, to the mountain whither Jeſus*
17 *had appointed them to repair. When they ſaw him, they threw them-*
18 *ſelves proſtrate before him; yet ſome doubted. Jeſus came near, and ſaid to them*, All authority is given to me in heaven and upon the
19 earth; go, therefore, convert all the nations, baptizing them in the Mar. 16; 15.
20 name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; teaching them to obſerve all the things which I have commanded you: and behold! I am with you always, even to the concluſion of this ſtate. *Amen.*

(e) With us *Saturday.* (f) With us *Sunday.*

PREFACE

TO

MARK's GOSPEL.

THAT the Goſpel was written by Mark which is commonly aſcribed to him, and that it was the ſecond in the order of time, are points for which the unanimous voice of antiquity can evidently be pleaded. The firſt authority to be produced, in ſupport of both theſe articles, is Papias, to whom, as the oldeſt witneſs, and, conſequently, in a caſe of this nature, the moſt important, we are chiefly indebted for what has been advanced in relation to the Evangeliſt Matthew. What he ſays concerning Mark may be thus rendered from the words of Euſebius (*a*), who quotes him: "This is what was related by the elder (that is, John, not the Apoſtle, "but a diſciple of Jeſus); Mark being Peter's interpreter, wrote exactly whatever he "remembered, not indeed in the order wherein things were ſpoken and done by "the Lord; for he was not himſelf a hearer or follower of our Lord, but he after-"wards, as I ſaid, followed Peter, who gave inſtructions as ſuited the occaſions, "but not as a regular hiſtory of our Lord's teaching. Mark, however, committed "no miſtake in writing ſuch things as occurred to his memory: for of this one "thing he was careful, to omit nothing which he had heard, and to inſert no falſe-"hood into his narrative." Such is the teſtimony of Papias, which is the more to be regarded, as he aſſigns his authority. He ſpoke not from hearſay, but from the information he had received from a moſt credible witneſs, John the elder or preſbyter, a diſciple of Jeſus, and companion of the Apoſtles by whom he had been intruſted with a miniſtry in the church.

§ 2. IT would be ſuperfluous here to add other teſtimonies. Suffice it to ſay, that what is above advanced by Papias, on the authority of John, is contradicted by no perſon. It is, on the contrary, confirmed by all who take occaſion to mention

(*a*) Hiſt. Eccl. l. iii. c. 39.

the ſubject. I ſhall only ſubjoin the account given by Irenæus, becauſe it ſerves to aſcertain another circumſtance, namely, that the publication of Mark's Goſpel, the ſecond in the order of time, ſoon followed that of Matthew's. After telling us that Matthew publiſhed his Goſpel, whilſt Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, he adds (*b*): "After their departure (ἔξοδον), Mark alſo, the diſciple and interpreter of "Peter, delivered to us, in writing, the things which had been preached by Peter." The Greek ἔξοδος, like the Engliſh word *departure*, and the word uſed in the old Latin edition *exceſſus*, is equivocal; it may either denote *death*, which is a departure out of this world, or mean a departure out of the city. It is probably in the former of theſe ſenſes that the word is here uſed. Yet by the accounts given by ſome others, Mark's Goſpel was publiſhed in Peter's lifetime, and had his approbation. But not to inſiſt on matters which cannot now be aſcertained, it ſufficeth us, that we know by whom this Goſpel was written, and whence the writer drew his information. Indeed this latter point has, from the earlieſt times, been conſidered as ſo well authenticated, that ſome have not ſcrupled to denominate this, *the Goſpel according to Peter*. They did not intend thereby to diſpute Mark's title to be eſteemed the writer, but to expreſs, in a ſtronger manner, that every thing here advanced had the ſanction of that Apoſtle's teſtimony, than whom no diſciple more cloſely attended our Lord's miniſtry, from its commencement to its conſummation. The Goſpel of Mark is ſaid, by ſome, to be but two years poſterior in date to that of Matthew. About this, however, it is in vain to think to arrive at certainty.

§ 3. BUT as to the perſon here named Mark, authors are not equally agreed. Some have thought that it was he of whom mention is ſeveral times made in the Acts, and ſome of Paul's Epiſtles, who is called *John*, whoſe ſurname is *Mark*, and whoſe mother's name was Mary (*c*); of whom we are likewiſe told that he was ſiſter's ſon to Barnabas (*d*). From the little we are able to collect out of the apoſtolic writings, it appears to me rather improbable, that this is he. Of John ſurnamed Mark, one of the firſt things we learn is, that he attended Paul and Barnabas in their apoſtolical journeys, when theſe two travelled together (*e*). And when afterwards there aroſe a diſpute between them concerning him, inſomuch that they ſeparated, Mark accompanied his uncle Barnabas, and Silas attended Paul. When Paul was reconciled to Mark, which was probably ſoon after (for though among good men there may ariſe differences, as theſe differences are not embittered by any malignity of diſpoſition, a reconciliation is eaſily effected), we find Paul again employing Mark's aſſiſtance, recommending him, and giving him a very honourable teſtimony (*f*). But we hear not a ſyllable of his attending Peter, as his miniſter, or aſſiſting him in any capacity. This is ſo different from the accounts which the moſt ancient writers give of the Evangeliſt Mark, that though they cannot be ſaid to contradict each other, they can hardly be underſtood as ſpoken of the ſame individual. The Evangeliſt is not

(*b*) Adv. Hær. l. iii. c. 1.
(*c*) Acts, xii. 12.
(*d*) Col. iv. 10.
(*e*) Acts, xii. 25. xiii. 5.
(*f*) Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

not ſaid to have derived any part of his information from our Lord himſelf, or even from any of his Apoſtles, except the Apoſtle Peter (for no other is ever named), whoſe diſciple he is always repreſented as having been; and who, doubtleſs ſpeaks of him when he ſays (*g*), *Marcus my ſon ſaluteth you;* a denomination commonly given, in thoſe times, by the miniſter, to every one who by his means had been converted to the Chriſtian faith. But as to the nephew of Barnabas, we have ſeen how differently he is repreſented in the Acts, as well as in Paul's Epiſtles. And if we recur to tradition (for hiſtorical evidence cannot be pretended), it repreſents him as having been a diſciple of our Lord, and one of the Seventy, whom Jeſus in his lifetime ſent out to preach the Goſpel. Beſides, no ancient author, in ſpeaking of this Evangeliſt, ever calls him John, but always Mark. In brief, the accounts given of Paul's attendant, and thoſe of Peter's interpreter, concur in nothing but the name, Mark, or Marcus; too ſlight a circumſtance to conclude the ſameneſs of the perſon from, eſpecially when we conſider how common the name was at Rome, and how cuſtomary it was for the Jews, in that age, to aſſume ſome Roman name when they went thither.

§ 4. FURTHER, that Mark wrote his Goſpel in Greek, is as evidently conformable to the teſtimony of antiquity, as that Matthew wrote his in Hebrew. Cardinal Baronius is the only perſon who has ſtrenuouſly maintained the contrary, affirming that this evangeliſt publiſhed his work in Latin. I know no argument, worthy the name of argument, but one, that he produces in ſupport of his opinion. The external evidence of teſtimony is clear againſt him; but ſomething like internal probability may be urged in favour of his ſentiment. 'This Goſpel,' ſays the Cardinal, 'was publiſhed at Rome, for the benefit of the Romans. Can we then ſuppoſe it 'would be written in any other than the language of the place?' I ſhall admit that this Goſpel was publiſhed at Rome; though that is not univerſally believed, ſome rather ſuppoſing it to have been at Alexandria, after Mark had been entruſted with the ſuperintendence of that church; and though the deſign of the publication had been the benefit of thoſe reſiding at Rome, it would not have been excluſively intended for the natives. Let it be obſerved, that the miniſtry of Peter, to whom Paul tells us (*h*), the Goſpel of the circumciſion was committed, was chiefly employed in converting and inſtructing his countrymen the Jews, who abounded at that time in the imperial city. Now it was cuſtomary with ſuch of the Jews, as went abroad (I may ſay generally with travellers of all nations, eſpecially from the Eaſt), to make themſelves maſters of the Greek tongue, which was become a kind of univerſal language, and was more uſed by ſtrangers at Rome, than the language of the place. It was with ſuch that the firſt Chriſtian miſſionaries were principally concerned. The Apoſtle Paul accordingly wrote to them in Greek, and not in Latin, which he would not have been done, if the former language had not been then better underſtood in the Chriſtian congregation than the latter. Now, if there was no impropriety in Paul's writing

(*g*) 1 Pet. v. 13. (*h*) Gal. ii. 7.

writing them a very long Epiſtle in Greek, neither was there any in Mark's giving them his goſpel in that language. The only thing I know which looks like an ancient teſtimony in favour of the opinion of Baronius, is the inſcription ſubjoined to this Goſpel in Syriac, and in ſome other Oriental verſions. But it ought to be remembered, that theſe poſtſcripts are not the teſtimonies of the tranſlators. They proceed merely from the conjecture of ſome tranſcriber, but when written, or by whom, is equally unknown. But enough, perhaps too much, for ſetting aſide a mere hypotheſis, not only unſupported by poſitive evidence, but in direct contradiction to it.

§ 5. FROM this Goſpel, as well as from the former, we ſhould readily conclude that the Author was by birth and education a Jew. The Hebraiſms in the ſtyle (or examples of what has been called the idiom of the ſynagogue) are very evident throughout the whole. At the ſame time, as ſome critics have obſerved, there are ſeveral expreſſions here uſed, which clearly indicate that the writer had been accuſtomed for ſome time to live among the Latins. Not only does he uſe the Latin words, which are to be found in other Goſpels, and ſeem to have been then current in Judea, as λεγιων *legion*, and δηναριον *a denarius*; but he employs ſome which are peculiar to himſelf, as κεντυριων *centurion*, and σπεκουλατωρ *ſentinel*. Theſe have been pleaded as evidences that the original was Latin; but, in fact, they are much ſtronger marks of a Greek writer who had lived ſome years among the Latins, and had been accuſtomed to uſe, and hear uſed by others, ſuch names of offices as were famliarly known in the place. Nothing is more common with travellers, than to interlard their converſation with ſuch foreign words as thoſe now deſcribed. This is not always, as people are apt to ſuſpect, the effect of affectation: for it is manifeſt from experience, that ſuch words, in conſequence of the recent habit, do moſt readily ſuggeſt themſelves to the memory of the ſpeaker or writer, even though uſing a different tongue. There are ſome other internal evidences which have not eſcaped the notice of the inquiſitive, that this Goſpel was written in a country of ſtrangers, or at leaſt beyond the confines of Judea, where the names of places, and the peculiar phraſes relating to religious ceremonies, could not be ſo familiar to the people, not even to the Jews, as they would be in any part of Paleſtine. The firſt time the Jordan is mentioned (*i*), ποταμος is added to the name for explanation: for though no perſon in Judea needed to be informed that Jordan is a river, the caſe was different in diſtant countries. The word γεεννα, which, on account of its figurative application in the New Teſtament, is, in Engliſh, always rendered *hell*, is ſtrictly and originally the name of a place near Jeruſalem, *the valley of Hinnom*, where infants had been ſacrificed by fire to Moloch, a place well known to the inhabitants of the country, though perfectly unknown to thoſe of Italy or Egypt. This Evangeliſt, therefore, when he mentions it (*k*), very properly adds for explanation, το πυρ το ασβεστον, *the unquenchable fire*. Words and phraſes not uſed out of Paleſtine and the neighbouring

(*i*) Ch. i. 5. (*k*) Ch. ix. 43. 45.

neighbouring regions, are either not named by him at all, or attended, as the above example, with ſome circumſtance which may ſerve to explain them. Thus he avoids altogether the word *Mammon* uſed by Matthew and Luke, which, though familiar in Judea, and perhaps through all Syria, might not have been underſtood even by the Helleniſt Jews at Rome. He therefore makes the common term χρηματα *riches*, which could not be miſtaken any where, ſupply its place; and though he finds it convenient on one occaſion (*l*), to employ the Oriental word *Corban*, he immediately ſubjoins the interpretation ὁ ἐστι δῶρον, *that is, a gift*. In another place (*m*), he adopts the terms κοιναις χερσι, which, though not Oriental words, make a ſort of Oriental phraſeology, that would be unintelligible to the far greater part of Greek readers. For this reaſon he immediately explains himſelf by adding τουτ' ἐστιν, ανιπτοις; *that is, unwaſhen*. Add, to this, that the rite there alluded to is, in the following verſes, explained in a manner, which, to one in Matthew's circumſtances, who wrote for the immediate uſe of the natives of Judea, familiarized to ſuch obſervances, muſt have appeared entirely ſuperfluous. When the two Goſpels, Matthew's and Mark's, are on theſe points compared together, though the particulars in the compariſon, taken ſeverally, appear inconſiderable, they bear ſuch ſtrong internal characters as ſerve greatly to corroborate the hiſtorical proof we have relating to their reſpective authors and languages, the circumſtances of time, and place of publication, as well as the people for whoſe uſe they were reſpectively written. Such little points, which have nothing of the oſtentation of evidence, will be admitted by the judicious to have the more weight on that very account. And let it be obſerved, that though the church of Rome in that early period, and the ſame may be affirmed of the church of Alexandria, conſiſted moſtly of Helleniſt Jews, it was not confined to theſe. The ſacred writers, therefore who wrote in Greek, choſe very properly, ſo far to adapt their expreſſions as to be at leaſt intelligible to other readers of that language.

§ 6. There are ſome peculiarities of ſtyle which have been obſerved in this writer, ſuch as the more frequent uſe of the adverbs ευθυς and ευθεως, than is found in any other writer of the New Teſtament, his beginning ſentences oftener with και, and και ελεγεν αυτοις, idioms not unfrequent with the reſt. Auguſtin conſiders this Evangeliſt as the abridger of Matthew. *Marcus Matthæum ſubſecutus tanquam pedisſequus et breviator ejus videtur.* It is indeed true that Mark ſometimes copies the very expreſſions uſed by Matthew. That he is not, however, to be conſidered as an abridger, may be evinced by the following reaſons: Firſt, he omits altogether ſeveral things related by Matthew, our Lord's pedigree, his birth, the viſit of the Magians, Joſeph's flight into Egypt, the cruelty of Herod. As his intention appears to have been to give in brief the hiſtory of our Lord's miniſtry, he begins very properly with the preaching of the Baptiſt. Again, there are ſome other things in Matthew, whereof, though they fall within the time to which Mark had confined himſelf, he has taken no notice; and ſome things are mentioned by Mark which had been overlooked

(*l*) Ch. vii. 11. (*m*) Ch. vii. 2.

looked by Matthew. Further, he has not always followed the ſame arrangement with his predeceſſor; and his relation of ſome facts, ſo far from being an abridgment of Matthew's, is the more circumſtantial of the two. His ſtyle in general, inſtead of being more conciſe, is more diffuſe. That he had read Matthew's Goſpel, cannot be doubted. For their exact conformity in expreſſion in ſeveral places, Grotius has an ingenious manner of accounting. He ſuppoſes that Mark had carefully read Matthew's Goſpel in the original Hebrew, before it was tranſlated into Greek; and that he had the particulars freſh in his memory, when he was occupied in writing his Goſpel. Again, he ſuppoſes that the tranſlator of Matthew into Greek has thought it ſafeſt to adopt the expreſſions of Mark, wherever they would ſuit the Hebrew, from which he was tranſlating. But this, it muſt be confeſſed, though not implauſible, is mere conjecture. It is generally our Lord's diſcourſes which are abridged by Mark. As to his miracles, he has rather more fully related them. The additional circumſtances and incidents recorded in this Goſpel, appear to reſt upon the authority of the Apoſtles, but principally on that of Peter.

CONTENTS.

MARK's GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

The Entrance on the Ministry.

CH. I. II. III. 1—12.

JOHN's miſſion;—Jeſus baptized by him, and atteſted from heaven;—tempted by Satan;—anounces in Galilee the reign of God;—calls Peter, Andrew, James, and John;—performs miraculous cures;—calls Matthew;—eats with publicans;—vindicates himſelf and his diſciples from the accuſations of the Scribes and Phariſees;—in regard to blaſphemy, evil company, neglect of faſting, breach of Sabbath. *Page* 343

SECTION II.

The Nomination of Apoſtles.

CH. III. 13, &c. IV. V.

Jeſus ſelects his twelve Apoſtles;—is ſo much crowded by the people, that even his relations ſpeak diſreſpectfully of him for permitting them;—the abſurdity of the pretext, that by demons he expelled demons;—the danger of detracting from the Holy Spirit;—who accounted kinſmen by Jeſus;—the parable of the ſower, with the explanation;—the reaſon for uſing parables;—other moral inſtructions and ſimilitudes:—Jeſus ſtills a tempeſt on the ſea;—cures a demoniac who abode in tombs;—heals the woman who had the bloody iſſue;—reſtores the daughter of Jairus to life. 347

SECTION III.

The First Miſſion of the Apoſtles.

CH. VI.

Jeſus deſpiſed by his fellow citizens;—commiſſions the Apoſtles;—different opinions concerning him:—the death of John the Baptiſt:—the diſciples report the execution of their miſſion:—Jeſus feeds miraculouſly five thouſand in the deſert;—walks on the ſea in the morning to his diſciples, who had embarked the night before;—ſtills the wind, lands, and cures all who touch him. 351

SECTION IV.

The Errors of the Phariſees.

CH. VII. VIII. 1—26.

Jeſus vindicates his diſciples, and charges the Phariſees with annulling the commandment of God by their tradition:—nothing pollutes the man but vice:—a demon expelled from the daughter of a Syrophenician woman of great faith:—the cure of one deaf and dumb:—four thouſand men fed in the deſert:—a ſign in the ſky refuſed to the Phariſees:—the diſciples cautioned againſt their doctrine under the name of leaven, which they interpreting literally, miſunderſtood:—a blind man cured. 354

SECTION V.

The Transfiguration.

CH. VIII. 27, &c. IX. X. 1—31.

The opinions of the people concerning Jeſus:—Peter avows him to be the Meſſiah:—Jeſus foretells his own death and reſurrection;—rebukes Peter, who was ſcandalized at the mention of death:—warns his followers to prepare for ſuffering;—is transfigured;—acquaints them who the Elijah was that ſhould come;—cures a dumb demoniac:—humility the road to eminence, in his reign:—the ſervices of thoſe not to be rejected who did not accompany the Apoſtles:—no ſervice done for Jeſus ſhall be unrewarded:—the danger of offences and ſnares:—the marriage tie may not be looſed at the pleaſure of either party:—the people encouraged

couraged to bring children to Jeſus:—what muſt be done to obtain eternal life:—riches a great obſtruction in the way to the kingdom:—the reward of thoſe who abandon any thing for Jeſus. Page 356

SECTION. VI.

The Entry into Jerusalem.

CH. X. 32, &c. XI. XII. 1—12.

Jeſus, on the road to Jeruſalem, foretells his death and reſurrection;—is applied to, by the ſons of Zebedee, for the chief honours in his reign;—he warns them to prepare for ſuffering, as the only road to honour then would be humility;—gives ſight to Bartimeus;—rides into Jeruſalem on an aſs;—the people attending him with ſhouts;—devotes the barren fig-tree;—drives the traffickers out of the temple;—manifeſts the power of faith;—enjoins forgiveneſs on all who would be forgiven of God;—ſilences thoſe who controvert his authority;—illuſtrates their ingratitude to God, by the parable of the huſbandmen who ill-treated and killed their landlord's meſſenger's;—concludes with predicting the rejection of the Jews, and the call of the Gentiles. 361

SECTION VII.

The Prophecy on Mount Olivet.

CH. XII. 13, &c. XIII.

Jeſus eludes the craft of the Phariſees, who conſult him on the lawfulneſs of paying tribute to Ceſar;—vindicates the doctrine of the reſurrection againſt the Sadducees;—anſwers the ſcribe who queſtioned him about what is moſt important in the law;—puzzles the Phariſees with an expreſſion in the Pſalms applied to the Meſſiah;—warns the people againſt the ambition and hypocriſy of the Scribes;—the liberality of a gift muſt be rated by the circumſtances of the giver;—the deſtruction of the temple foretold;—the calamities by which it will be preceded;—the ſigns that the judge is at hand;—the time unknown to all but God;—the neceſſity of unintermitted vigilance. 364

SECTION VIII.

The last Supper.

CH. XIV. 1—52.

The rulers conſult together about the method of apprehending Jeſus:—a female diſciple anoints his head:—Judas bargains with the chief prieſts to deliver him to them:—Jeſus eats the paſſover with his diſciples;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them;—inſtitutes the commemoration of his death;—foretells their deſertion, and Peter's denial of him;—his diſtreſs in the garden;—he is ſeized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas. 367

SECTION IX.

The Crucifixion.

CH. XIV. 53, &c. XV. 1—41.

Jeſus is brought before the Sanhedrim;—charged with blaſphemy,—and condemned;—denied by Peter;—delivered bound to the Roman procurator;—before whom he is accuſed by the Jewiſh rulers:—Pilate perceiving that the accuſation proceeded from envy,—tries in vain to ſave him, under pretence of granting him to the prayer of the multitude, accuſtomed to obtain the releaſe of a priſoner at the paſſover;—they, inſtigated by their rulers, demand the releaſe of Barabbas, and the crucifixion of Jeſus:—Pilate at laſt conſents to gratify them:—Jeſus is ſcourged, mocked, and crucified between two malefactors;—is inſulted on the croſs by perſons of all denominations, fellow-ſufferers not excepted:—his death attended with prodigies, which ſtrike the Roman centurion and other ſpectators with aſtoniſhment. 369

SECTION X.

The Resurrection.

CH. XV. 42, &c. XVI.

The body of Jeſus given to Joſeph of Arimathea, who lays it in his own ſepulchre:—the reſurrection of Jeſus announced at the ſepulchre to ſome pious women by an angel;—he appears firſt to Mary Magdalene;—then to others;—afterwards to the eleven whom he ſends to publiſh his doctrine every where, empowering them to work miracles in evidence of their miſſion;—and is taken up into heaven. 372

THE

THE

G O S P E L

BY

M A R K.

SECTION I.

The Entrance on the Miniſtry.

I. *THE beginning of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt Son of God.*

2 *AS it is written in the Prophets,* " *Behold I ſend mine angel before* Mat. 3; 1.
3 " *thee, who ſhall prepare thy way:*" " *The voice of one proclaiming in* Lu. 3; 1.
" *the wilderneſs, prepare a way for the Lord (a); make for him a ſtraight* Jo. 1; 6.
4 " *paſſage:*" *thus came John baptizing in the wilderneſs, and publiſhing* Mal. 3; 1.
5 *the baptiſm of reformation for the remiſſion of ſins. And all the country* If. 40; 3.
of Judea, and the inhabitants of Jeruſalem reſorted to him, and were
6 *baptized by him in the river Jordan, confeſſing their ſins. Now John's*
clothing was of camels hair tied round his waiſt with a leathern girdle:
7 *and he lived upon locuſts and wild honey. And he proclaimed, ſaying,*
One mightier than I cometh after me, whoſe ſhoe-latchet I am not
8 worthy to ſtoop down and untie. I indeed have baptized you in
water; but he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit.
9 *At that time Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized* Mat. 3; 13.
10 *by John in Jordan. As ſoon as he aroſe out of the water, he ſaw the* Lu. 3; 21.
11 *ſky part aſunder, and the ſpirit deſcend upon him like a dove. And a* Jo. 1; 31.

(a) *Jehovah.*

voice was heard from heaven, which ſaid, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I delight.

Mat. 4; 1. Lu. 4; 1. 12 *Immediately after this the Spirit conveyed him into the wilderneſs;*
13 *and he continued there in the wilderneſs forty days tempted by Satan (b); and was among the wild beaſts; and the angels miniſtered to him.*

Mat. 4; 12. Lu. 4; 15. Jo. 4; 43. 14 *But after John's impriſonment, Jeſus went into Galilee, proclaiming*
15 *the good tidings of the reign of God.* The time, *ſaid he,* is accompliſhed; the reign of God approacheth; reform, and believe the good tidings.

Mat. 4; 18. Lu. 5; 1. Jo. 1; 35. 16 *Then walking by the ſea of Galilee, he ſaw Simon, and Andrew. Simon's brother, caſting a drag into the ſea, for they were fiſhers.*
17 *Jeſus ſaid to them,* Come with me, and I will make you become
18 fiſhers of men. *Immediately they left their nets, and followed him.*
19 *Paſſing on a little, and ſeeing James, ſon of Zebedee, with John his*
20 *brother, who were mending their nets in a bark; he immediately called them: whereupon leaving their father Zebedee in the bark with the hired ſervants, they accompanied him.*

Lu. 4; 31. Mat. 7; 28. 21 *And they went to Capernaum; and on the Sabbath, he repaired*
22 *directly to the ſynagogue, and inſtructed the people, who were aſtoniſhed at his manner of teaching; for he taught as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.*

Lu. 4; 33. 23 *Now there was in their ſynagogue a man poſſeſſed with an unclean*
24 *ſpirit, who cried out,* Ah! Jeſus of Nazareth, what haſt thou to do with us? Art thou come to deſtroy us? I know who thou art, the
25 holy one of God. *Jeſus rebuking him, ſaid,* Be ſilent, and come
26 out of him. *Then the unclean ſpirit threw him into convulſions, and*
27 *raiſing loud cries, came out of him: at which they were all ſo amazed, that they aſked one another,* What meaneth this? What new teaching is this? for he commandeth with authority even the unclean ſpirits,
28 and they obey him. *And thenceforth his fame ſpread through all the region of Galilee.*

Mat. 8; 14. 29 *As ſoon as they were come out of the ſynagogue, they went with James*
30 *and John into the houſe of Simon and Andrew, where Simon's wife's mother lay ſick of a fever, whereof they immediately acquainted Jeſus.*
31 *And he came, and taking her by the hand, raiſed her; inſtantly the fever left her, and ſhe entertained them.*
32 *In the evening, after ſun-ſet, they brought to him all the ſick, and*
33 *the demoniacs; the whole city being aſſembled at the door. And he healed many perſons affected with various diſeaſes, and expelled many*
Lu. 4; 41. *demons, whom he permitted not to ſpeak, becauſe they knew him.*

(b) *Adverſary.*

35 *On the morrow, having riſen before the dawn, he went out and re-*
36 *tired to a ſolitary place, and prayed there. And Simon and his company*
37 *went in queſt of him, and having found him, ſaid to him,* Every body
38 ſeeketh thee. *Jeſus ſaid,* Let us go to the neighbouring boroughs to proclaim [the reign] there alſo; for I came out with this deſign.
39 *Accordingly he proclaimed it in their ſynagogues throughout all Galilee, and expelled demons.*

40 *And a leper came to him, and on his knees entreated him, ſaying,* If Mat. 8; 2.
41 thou wilt, thou canſt cleanſe me. *Jeſus had compaſſion, and ſtretched* Lu. 5; 12.
42 *out his hand, and touching him, ſaid,* I will; be thou cleanſed. *This he had no ſooner uttered, than the leproſy departed from the man, and*
43 *he was cleanſed. Then Jeſus ſtrictly charging him, and diſmiſſing him,*
44 *ſaid,* See thou tell nothing of this to any man; but go, ſhow thyſelf Lev. 14; 2.
to the prieſt; and offer for thy cleanſing, the things preſcribed by
45 Moſes, that it may be notified to the people. *But the man, as ſoon as he was gone, began to blaze this ſtory, talking openly every where, inſomuch that Jeſus could no longer appear publicly in the city, but remained without in ſolitary places, whither people reſorted to him from all parts.*

II. *AFTER many days he returned to Capernaum; and when it was*
2 *known that he was in the houſe, ſuch a multitude flocked thither, that there was no room for them, not even near the door, and he taught them the word [of God].*

3 *A paralytic was then brought, carried by four men, who not being* Mat. 9; 1.
able to come nigh him for the crowd, uncovered the place where Jeſus Lu. 5; 18.
was, and through the opening let down the couch whereon the paralytic lay,
5 *Jeſus perceiving their faith, ſaid to the paralytic,* Son, thy ſins are
6 forgiven thee. *But certain Scribes who were preſent, reaſoned thus* Lu. 7; 48.
7 *within themſelves: 'How doth this man ſpeak ſuch blaſphemies? Who*
8 *can forgive ſins but God?' Jeſus immediately knowing in himſelf that they made theſe reflections, ſaid to them,* Why do ye reaſon thus within
9 yourſelves? Which is eaſier, to ſay to the paralytic, 'Thy ſins are
'forgiven,' or to ſay [with effect], 'Ariſe, take up thy couch and
10 'walk? But that ye may know, that the Son of Man hath power
11 upon the earth to forgive ſins, riſe *(he ſaid to the paralytic)*, I com-
12 mand thee, take up thy couch and go home. *Immediately he aroſe, took up the couch, and walked out before them all; inſomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, ſaying,* We never ſaw any thing like this.

13 *Again, he went out towards the ſea, and all the multitude repaired*
14 *to him, and he taught them. Paſſing along, he ſaw Levi, ſon of Al-* Mat. 9; 9.
Lu. 5; 27.
phæus,

pheus, ſitting at the toll-office, and ſaid to him Follow me. *And he*
15 *aroſe and followed him. Now when Jeſus was at meat in this man's*
houſe, ſeveral publicans and ſinners placed themſelves at table with him
16 *and his diſciples; for many of theſe people followed him. The Scribes*
and the Phariſees, ſeeing him eat with publicans and ſinners, ſaid to his
diſciples, Wherefore doth he eat and drink with publicans and ſinners?
17 *Jeſus hearing this, replied*, The whole need not a phyſician, but the
ſick. I came not to call the righteous, but ſinners [to reformation].
Mat. 9; 14. 18 *The diſciples of John, and thoſe of the Phariſees, accuſtomed to faſting*
Lu. 5; 33. *came to him and ſaid*, John's diſciples, and thoſe of the Phariſees, faſt;
19 why do not thy diſciples faſt? *Jeſus anſwered*, Do the bridemen faſt
while the bridegroom is with them? While the bridegroom is with
20 them they do not faſt. But the days will come when the bridegroom
21 ſhall be taken from them; and in thoſe days they will faſt. Nobody
ſeweth a piece of undreſſed cloth on an old garment; otherwiſe
the new patch teareth the old cloth, and maketh a worſe rent.
22 Nobody putteth new wine into old leathern bottles; elſe the new wine
burſteth the bottles; and thus both the wine is ſpilt, and the bottles
are rendered uſeleſs; but new wine muſt be put into new bottles.
Mat. 12; 1. 23 *Once, when he was going through the corn on the Sabbath, his diſ-*
Lu. 6; 1. 24 *ciples plucked the ears of corn as they went. The Phariſees ſaid to him,*
1 Sam. 21; 1. 25 Why do they that which on the Sabbath it is unlawful to do? *He*
anſwered, Did ye never read what David and his attendants did in a
26 ſtrait, when they were hungry, how he entered the tabernacle of
God, in the days of Abiathar the high prieſt, and ate the loaves of
the preſence, which none but the prieſts could lawfully eat, and gave
27 thereof alſo to his attendants? *He added*, The Sabbath was made for
28 man, not man for the Sabbath. Therefore the Son of Man is
maſter even of the Sabbath.
Mat. 12; 9. III. *Another time he entered the ſynagogue, when a man was there who*
Lu. 6; 6. 2 *had a withered hand. And they, with a deſign to accuſe him, watched*
3 *him, to ſee whether he would heal the man on the Sabbath. Jeſus ſaid*
4 *to the man who had the withered hand*, Stand up in the midſt. *Then*
he ſaid to them, Whether is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath, or
5 to do evil; to ſave, or to kill? *But they were ſilent. And looking*
round on them with anger, being grieved for the blindneſs of their minds,
he ſaid to the man, Stretch out thy hand: *and as he ſtretched out his*
6 *hand, it became ſound like the other. And the Phariſees went out*
immediately, and conſpired with the Herodians againſt him, to deſtroy
him.
7 *But Jeſus withdrew with his diſciples towards the ſea, whither a*
8 *great multitude followed him from Galilee, from Judea from Jeruſalem,*
from

from Idumea (c), and from the banks of the Jordan. They alſo of the territories of Tyre and Sidon, having heard what wonders he had per-
9 *formed, flocked to him in crowds. Then he ordered his diſciples to get a*
10 *boat to attend him, becauſe of the multitude, leſt they ſhould throng*
11 *him: for he had healed many, which made all who had maladies preſs him to touch him. And the unclean ſpirits, when they beheld him, proſtrated themſelves before him, crying,* Thou art the Son of God.
12 *But he ſtrictly charged them not to make him known.*

SECTION II.

The Nomination of Apoſtles.

13 *AFTERWARDS he went up a mountain, and called to him whom he*
14 *would, and they went to him. And he ſelected twelve, that they might attend him, and that he might commiſſion them to proclaim [the*
15 *reign], empowering them to cure diſeaſes, and to expel demons. Theſe*
17 *were Simon, whom he ſurnamed Peter, and James, ſon of Zebedee, and John the brother of James. Theſe he ſurnamed Boanerges, that is, ſons*
18 *of thunder; and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James ſon of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and*
19 *Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iſcariot who betrayed him.*
20 *Then they went into a houſe, whither the people again crowded ſo*
21 *faſt, that Jeſus and his diſciples could not ſo much as eat. His kinſmen hearing this, went out to lay hold on him, for they ſaid,* He is beſide
22 himſelf. *But the Scribes who came from Jeruſalem ſaid,* He is con- Mat. 9; 34. & 12; 24. Lu. 11; 15.
federate with Beelzebub, and expelleth demons by the prince of
23 the demons. *Jeſus having called them, ſaid to them by ſimilitude,*
24 How can Satan expel Satan? If a kingdom be torn by factions, that
25 kingdom cannot ſubſiſt. And if a family be torn by factions, that
26 family cannot ſubſiſt. Thus, if Satan fight againſt himſelf, and be
27 divided, he cannot ſubſiſt, but is near his end. No one who entereth a ſtrong man's houſe, can plunder his goods, unleſs he firſt overpower the ſtrong man; then, indeed, he may plunder the houſe.
28 Verily I ſay unto you, that though all other ſins in the ſons of men Mat. 12; 31. Lu. 12; 10. 1 Jo. 5; 16.
29 are pardonable, and whatever detractions they ſhall utter; whoſoever ſhall detract from the Holy Spirit, ſhall never be pardoned, but is
30 liable to eternal puniſhment. [*He ſaid this,*] *becauſe they affirmed that he was leagued with an unclean ſpirit.*

Mat. 10; 1. Lu. 6; 12; ch. 6; 7.

Meanwhile

(c) In the Old Teſtament commonly *Edom.*

Mat. 12; 46. Lu. 8; 19. 31 *Meanwhile came his mother and brothers, who ſtanding without, ſent*
32 *for him. And the crowd who ſat round him, ſaid to him,* Lo, thy
33 mother and thy brothers are without, and ſeek thee. *He anſwered*
34 *them, ſaying,* Who is my mother or my brothers? *And looking about*
on thoſe who ſat around him, he ſaid, Behold my mother and my
3 brothers: for whoſoever doth the will of God, is my brother, my
my ſiſter, and mother.

Mat. 13; 1. IV. *Again, he was teaching by the ſea-ſide, when ſo great a multitude*
gathered about him, that he was obliged to go aboard a bark and ſit there,
2 *while all the people remained on ſhore. Then he taught them many things*
by parables.

Mat. 13; 4. Lu. 8; 4. 3 *In teaching, he ſaid to them,* Attend, behold the ſower went out
4 to ſow. And as he ſowed, part of the ſeed fell by the way-ſide,
5 and the birds came and picked it up; part fell upon rocky ground,
where it had little mould. This ſprang the ſooner, becauſe there
6 was no depth of ſoil. But after the ſun had beaten upon it, it was
7 ſcorched, and having no root, it withered away. Part fell amidſt
thorns; and the thorns grew up and ſtifled it, ſo that it yielded
8 nothing. Part fell into good ground, and ſprang up, and became
ſo fruitful, that ſome grains produced thirty, ſome ſixty, and ſome a
9 hundred. *He added,* Whoever hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Mat. 13; 10. Lu. 8; 9. 10 *When he was in private, thoſe who were about him with the twelve*
11 *aſked him the meaning of the parable. He ſaid to them,* It is your
privilege to know the ſecrets of the reign of God, but to thoſe
Iſ. 6. 9. 12 without every thing is veiled in parables; that they may not per-
ceive what they look at, or underſtand what they hear; leſt they
13 ſhould be reclaimed, and obtain the forgiveneſs of their ſins. *He*
ſaid alſo to them, Do ye not underſtand this parable? How then will
ye underſtand all [my] parables?

Mat. 15; 18. Lu. 8; 11. 14 The ſower is he who diſperſeth the word. The wayſide on which
ſome of the grain fell, denoteth thoſe who have no ſooner heard the
word, than Satan cometh and taketh away that which was ſown in
16 their hearts. The rocky ground denoteth thoſe who hearing the
17 word, receive it at firſt with pleaſure; yet not having it rooted in
their minds, retain it but a while; for when trouble or perſecution
18 cometh becauſe of the word, they inſtantly relapſe. The ground
19 over-run with thorns, denoteth thoſe hearers in whomworldly cares,
and the deluſion of riches, and the inordinate deſires of other things,
20 ſtifle the word and render it unfruitful. The good ſoil on which
ſome grains yielded thirty, ſome ſixty, and ſome a hundred, de-
noteth thoſe who hear the word and retain it, and produce the fruits
thereof.

21 *He ſaid further*, Is a lamp brought to be put under a corn-meaſure, Mat 5; 15.
22 or under a bed; and not to be ſet on a ſtand? For there is no ſecret Lu. 8; 16.
that is not to be diſcovered; nor hath aught been concealed which & 11; 33.
23 was not to be divulged. If any man have ears to hear let him hear. Mat. 10; 26.

24 *He ſaid, moreover*, Conſider what ye hear: with the meaſure Lu. 8; 18.
wherewith ye give, ye ſhall receive; and to you who are attentive, Mat. 7; 2.
25 more ſhall be added. For to him who hath, more ſhall be given; Lu. 6; 38.
but from him who hath not, even that which he hath ſhall be taken. Mat. 13; 12. & 25; 29.

26 *He ſaid alſo*, The kingdom of God is like ſeed which a man ſowed Lu. 19; 26.
27 in his field. While he ſlept by night and waked by day, the ſeed
28 ſhot up, and grew without his minding it. For the earth produceth
29 of itſelf firſt the blade, then the ear; afterwards the full corn. But
as ſoon as the grain was ripe, he applied the ſickle, becauſe it was
time to reap it.

30 *He ſaid alſo*, Whereunto ſhall we compare the kingdom of God; Mat. 13; 31.
31 or by what ſimilitude ſhall we repreſent it? It is like a grain of
muſtard-ſeed, which, when it is ſown in the earth, is the ſmalleſt of
32 all the ſeeds that are there. But after it is ſown, it ſpringeth up,
and becometh greater than any herb, and ſhooteth out branches ſo
large, that under their ſhade the birds of the air may find ſhelter.

33 *And in many ſuch ſimilitudes he conveyed inſtruction to the people, as*
34 *he found them diſpoſed to hear; and without a ſimilitude he told them*
nothing: but he ſolved all to his diſciples in private.

35 *That day, in the evening, he ſaid to them*, Let us paſs to the other Mat. 8; 23.
36 ſide. *And they leaving the people, but having him in the bark, ſet ſail* Lu. 8; 22.
37 *in company with other ſmall barks. Then there aroſe a great ſtorm of*
38 *wind, and the billows beat into the bark, ſo that it was now full. Jeſus*
being in the ſtern, aſleep on a pillow, they awaken him, ſaying, Rabbi,
39 careſt thou not that we periſh? *And he aroſe and commanded the wind,*
ſaying to the ſea, Peace! be ſtill! *Immediately the wind ceaſed, and a*
40 *great calm enſued. And he ſaid to them*, Why are ye ſo timorous? How
41 is it that ye have no faith? *And they were exceedingly terrified, and ſaid*
one to another, Who is this whom even the wind and the ſea obey?

V. *Then they croſſed the ſea and came into the country of the Gadarenes.*
2 *He was no ſooner gone aſhore, than there met him a man coming from* Mat. 8; 28.
3 *the monuments, poſſeſſed by an unclean ſpirit, who made his abode in the* Lu. 8; 26.
4 *tombs; and no man could confine him, not even with chains. For he had*
been often bound with fetters and chains, and had wrenched off the chains,
5 *and broken the fetters, ſo that nobody was able to tame him. He was*
continually night and day in the mountains and in the tombs howling and
6 *cutting himſelf with flints. But when he ſaw Jeſus afar off, he ran,*
7 *and proſtrating himſelf before him, cried out*, What haſt thou to do with

me, Jesus, Son of the most high God, I conjure thee by God not to
8 torment me. (*For Jesus had said to him*, Come out of the man, thou
9 unclean spirit.) *Jesus asked him*, What is thy name? *He answered*,
10 My name is legion (*d*), for we are many. *And he earnestly entreated*
11 *him not to drive them out of the country. Now there was a great herd*
12 *of swine feeding on the mountain. And all the fiends besought him, say-*
ing, Suffer us to go to the swine, that we may enter into them.
13 *Jesus immediately permitted them. Then the unclean spirits being gone*
out, entered into the swine; and the herd, in number about two thousand,
14 *rushed down a precipice into the sea, and were choaked. And the swine-*
herds fled, and told it in the city and villages. And the people flocked
15 *out to see what had happened. When they came to Jesus, and saw him*
who had been possessed by the legion, sitting and clothed, and in his right
16 *mind, they were afraid. And those who had seen the whole, having*
related to them what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine;
17 *They entreated him to leave their territories. As he entered the bark,*
19 *the man who had been possessed, begged permission to attend him. Jesus,*
however, did not permit him, but said, Go home to thy relations, and
20 tell them what great things the Lord in pity hath done for thee. *Ac-*
cordingly he departed, publishing in Decapolis (e) what great things Jesus
had done for him. And all were amazed.

Mat. 9; 18. Lu. 8; 41. 21 *Jesus having repassed in the bark, a great crowd gathered round him,*
22 *while he was on the shore. Then came one of the directors of the syna-*
23 *gogue, named Jairus, who seeing him, threw himself at his feet, and*
entreated him earnestly, saying, My little daughter is in extreme dan-
ger; I pray thee come and lay thy hands upon her to recover her,
24 and she will be well. *And Jesus went with him, followed by a great*
multitude who thronged him.

Mat. 9; 19. Lu. 8; 43. 25 *And a woman who had been twelve years distressed with an issue of blood,*
26 *who had suffered much from several physicians, and had spent her all*
27 *without receiving any relief, but rather growing worse, having heard*
28 *of Jesus, came in the crowd behind, and touched his mantle; for she*
29 *had said, 'If I but touch his clothes, I shall recover.' Instantly the*
source of her distemper was dried up, and she felt in her body that she
30 *was delivered from that scourge. Jesus immediately, conscious of the*
virtue which had issued from him, turned towards the crowd, saying,
31 Who touched my clothes? *His disciples answered*, Thou seest how
the multitude throng thee; yet thou sayest, 'Who touched me?'
32 *But he looked round him, to see her who had done it. Then the woman,*
knowing the change wrought upon her, came trembling with fear, threw
herself

(*d*) About 6000. (*e*) A district of ten cities.

34 *herſelf proſtrate before him, and confeſſed the whole truth. But he ſaid*
to her, Daughter, thy faith hath cured thee; go in peace releaſed Lu. 7; 50.
from this ſcourge.
35 *Ere he had done ſpeaking, meſſengers came from the houſe of the di-* Lu. 8; 49.
rector of the ſynagogue, who ſaid, Thy daughter is dead, why ſhou'dſt
36 thou trouble the teacher any further? *Jeſus hearing this meſſage de-*
37 *livered, ſaid immediately to the director*, Fear not; only believe. *And*
he allowed nobody to follow him except Peter and James, and John the
38 *brother of James. Being arrived at the director's houſe, and ſeeing the* Mat. 9; 23.
39 *tumult, and the people weeping and wailing immoderately, he ſaid to*
them, as he entered, Why do ye weep and make a buſtle? the child
40 is not dead but aſleep. *And they derided him. But having made them*
all go out, he took with him the child's father and mother, and thoſe who
41 *came with him; and he entered the chamber where ſhe was lying, and,*
taking her by the hand, ſaid to her, Talitha cumi *(which ſignifieth,*
42 *'Damſel ariſe,'* I command thee. *Immediately the damſel aroſe and*
walked, for ſhe was twelve years old; and they were confounded with
43 *aſtoniſhment. But he ſtrictly enjoined them not to mention it to any body,*
and ordered that ſomething ſhould be given her to eat.

SECTION III.

The firſt Miſſion of the Apoſtles.

VI. *JESUS leaving that place went to his own country, accompanied by* Mat. 13; 54.
2 *his diſciples. And on the Sabbath he taught in their ſynagogues,* Lu. 4; 16.
and many who heard him ſaid with aſtoniſhment, Whence hath this
man theſe abilities? and what wiſdom is this which he hath gotten,
3 that even ſo great miracles are performed by him? Is not this the car- Jo. 6; 42.
penter, the ſon of Mary, the brother of James and Joſes, and Judas
and Simon? Are not his ſiſters alſo here with us? *And they were ſcan-*
4 *dalized at him. But Jeſus ſaid to them*, A prophet is nowhere diſre- Jo. 4; 44.
garded, except in his own country, among his own relations, and
5 in his own houſe. *And he could do no miracle there, except curing*
6 *a few ſick by laying his hands on them. And he wondered at their*
unbelief.
7 *And he went through the neighbouring villages teaching. And* Mat. 10; 1.
having called to him the twelve, he ſent them out by two and two, and Lu. 9; 1.
8 *gave them power over the unclean ſpirits; and ordered them to take* ch. 3; 14.
nothing for their journey but a ſingle ſtaff, no bag, no bread, and in
9 *their girdle no money; to be ſhod with ſandals, and not to put on two* Acts, 12; 8.
10 *coats. He ſaid alſo*, Whatever houſe ye enter in any place, continue
in

11 in that houſe until ye leave the place. But whereſoever they will
Acts, 13; 51. not receive you, nor hear you, ſhake off the duſt under your feet at
your departure, as a proteſtation againſt them. Verily I ſay unto
you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorra ſhall be more tolerable in
12 the day of judgment than the condition of that city. *And being de-*
13 *parted, they publicly warned men to reform; and expelled many demons,*
and cured many ſick perſons, anointing them with oil.

Mat. 14; 1. Lu. 9; 7. 14 *And king Herod heard of him (for his name was become famous) and*
ſaid, John the baptizer is raiſed from the dead; and therefore miracles
15 are performed by him. *Others ſaid,* It is Elijah. *Others,* It is a
16 prophet like thoſe of ancient times. *But when Herod heard of him,*
he ſaid, This is John whom I beheaded. He is raiſed from the dead.

Mat. 14; 3. Lu. 3; 19. 17 *For Herod had cauſed John to be apprehended, and kept bound in pri-*
ſon, on account of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, whom he had
Lev. 18; 16. & 20; 21. 18 *himſelf married. For John had ſaid to Herod,* It is not lawful for
19 thee to have thy brother's wife. *Now Herodias reſented this, and*
20 *would have killed him, but could not, becauſe Herod reſpected John,*
knowing him to be a juſt and holy man, and protected him, and did many
21 *things recommended by him, and heard him with pleaſure. At length a*
favourable opportunity offered, which was Herod's birth-day, when he
made an entertainment for the great officers of his court and army, and
22 *the perſons of diſtinction in Galilee. For the daughter of Herodias*
came in, and danced before them, and pleaſed Herod and his gueſts ſo
much, that the king ſaid to the damſel, Aſk whatever thou wilt, and
23 I will give it thee; *nay, he ſwore to her,* Whatever thou ſhalt aſk,
24 I will give thee, were it the half of my kingdom. *And ſhe withdrew*
and ſaid to her mother, What ſhall I aſk? *She anſwered,* The head of
25 John the Baptiſt. *Her daughter then, returning haſtily to the king,*
made this requeſt: I would that thou give me preſently in a baſin the
26 head of John the Baptiſt. *And the king was much grieved; however,*
27 *from a regard to his oath, and his gueſts, he would not refuſe her, but*
immediately diſpatched a ſentinel with orders to bring the Baptiſt's head.
28 *Accordingly he went and beheaded him in the priſon, and brought his*
head in a baſin, and preſented it to the damſel; and the damſel preſented
29 *it to her mother. When his diſciples heard this, they went and fetched*
his corpſe, and laid it in a monument.

Lu. 9; 10. Mat. 14; 13. 30 *NOW the Apoſtles being aſſembled related every thing to Jeſus, both*
31 *what they had done, and what they had taught. And he ſaid to them,*
Come ye apart into a deſert place, and reſt a while; *for there were ſo*
many coming and going, that they had not leiſure ſo much as to eat.
Jo. 6; 1. 32 *And they retired by ſhip to a deſert place to be by themſelves. But many*
who ſaw them depart, and knew whither they were ſailing, ran out of all

the cities, and got thither by land before them, and came together to him.
34 *Jeſus being landed ſaw a great multitude, and had compaſſion on them;* Mat. 9; 36.
becauſe they were as a flock which hath no ſhepherd; and he taught them many things.
35 *When it grew late, his diſciples came to him and ſaid,* This is a de- Mat. 14; 15.
36 ſert place, and it is now late; diſmiſs the people that they may go to Lu. 9; 12.
the neighbouring farms and villages, and buy themſelves bread, for Jo. 6; 5.
37 they have nothing to eat. *He anſwering, ſaid unto them,* Supply them yourſelves. *They replied,* Shall we go and give two hundred
38 denarii (*f*) for bread, in order to ſupply them? *He ſaid to them,* How many loaves have ye? go and ſee. *Upon inquiry they anſwered,*
39 Five, and two fiſhes. *And he commanded them to make all the people*
40 *lie down upon the green graſs in ſeparate companies. And they formed*
41 *themſelves into ſquares, by hundreds and by fifties. Then Jeſus taking the five loaves and the two fiſhes, and looking up to heaven, bleſſed and broke the loaves, and gave them to his diſciples to ſet before the multitude.*
42 *He diſtributed alſo the two fiſhes among them all. When they all had*
43 *eaten and were ſatisfied, they carried off twelve baſkets full of the frag-*
44 *ments of the bread and of the fiſhes. Now they who ate of the loaves were five thouſand men.*
45 *And immediately he obliged his diſciples to embark, and paſs over before* Mat. 14; 22.
46 *towards Bethſaida, while he diſmiſſed the people. And having ſent* Jo. 6; 16.
47 *them away, he retired to a mountain to pray. In the evening, the bark*
48 *being in the midſt of the ſea, and he alone on the land, he obſerved them toiling at the oar, for the wind was againſt them: and about the fourth watch of the night (g), he went to them, walking upon the water, and*
49 *ſeemed intending to paſs by them. When they ſaw him walking upon the*
50 *ſea, they thought it was an apparition, and cried out. For they all ſaw him, and were terrified; but he immediately ſpoke to them, ſaying,*
51 Take courage, it is I, be not afraid. *And having gone aboard to them, the wind ceaſed, which ſtruck them ſtill more with aſtoniſhment and*
52 *admiration: for their minds were ſo ſtupified, that they never reflected upon the loaves.*
53 *When they had croſſed, they came to the territory of Geneſaret (h),* Mat. 14; 34.
54 *where they landed. And being come aſhore, the people knew him, and ran through all that country, carrying the ſick on couches to every place where*
56 *they heard he was. And whatever village, or city, or town he entered, they laid the diſeaſed in the ſtreets, and beſought him that they might touch, were it but a tuft of his mantle; and whoſoever touched him were healed.*

(*f*) About 6l. 5s. ſterling. (*g*) Between three and ſix in the morning.
(*h*) In the Old Teſtament *Chinnereth.*

SECTION IV.

The Errors of the Phariſees.

Mat. 15; 1. VII. *THERE reſorted to him alſo the Phariſees, and ſome Scribes who*
2 *came from Jeruſalem. When theſe obſerved ſome of his diſciples*
3 *eating with impure (that is, unwaſhen) hands, they found fault. For*
the Phariſees, and indeed all the Jews, obſerving the tradition of the
elders, eat not until they have waſhed their hands, by pouring a little
4 *water upon them; and if they be come from the market, by dipping them;*
and many other uſages there are which they have adopted, as bap-
5 *tiſms of cups and pots, and brazen veſſels and beds. Then the Phariſees*
and the Scribes aſked him, Whence cometh it that thy diſciples obſerve
6 not the tradition of the elders, but eat with unwaſhen hands? *He*
Iſ. 29; 13. *anſwering, ſaid unto them,* O hypocrites, well do ye ſuit the character
which Iſaiah gave of you, when he ſaid, "This people honoureth
7 "me with their lips; but their heart is eſtranged from me. In vain,
"however, they worſhip me, while they teach inſtitutions merely
8 "human." For laying aſide the commandment of God, ye retain
the tradition of men, baptiſms of pots and cups, and many other the
9 like practices. Ye judge well, *continued he,* in annulling the com-
Ex. 20; 12. 10 mandment of God, to make room for your tradition. For Moſes
Deut. 5; 16. hath ſaid, "Honour thy father and thy mother;" and, "Whoſo-
Ex. 21; 17. Lev. 20; 9. 11 "ever revileth father or mother, ſhall be puniſhed with death." But
Pro. 20; 20. ye maintain, If a man ſay to father or mother, 'Be it corban *(that*
12 *'is 'devoted')* whatever of mine ſhall profit thee;' he muſt not
13 thenceforth do aught for his father or mother; thus invalidating the
word of God by the tradition which ye have eſtabliſhed. And in
many other inſtances ye act thus.
Mat. 15; 10. 14 *Then having called the whole multitude, he ſaid to them,* Hear-
15 ken to me all of you, and be inſtructed. There is nothing from
without which, entering into a man, can pollute him; but the things
which proceed from within the man, are the things that pollute him.
16 If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.
17 *When he had withdrawn from the people into the houſe, his diſciples*
Mat. 15; 15. 18 *aſked him the meaning of that ſentence. He anſwered,* Are ye alſo void
of underſtanding? Do ye not conceive, that whatſoever from with-
19 out entereth into the man, cannot pollute him; becauſe it entereth not
into his heart, but into his belly, whence all impurities in the victuals
20 paſs into the ſink. But, *added he,* that which proceedeth out of the
21 man, is what polluteth the man: for from within the human heart

proceed

22 proceed vicious machinations, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts,
23 inſatiable deſires, malevolence, fraud, immodeſty, envy, calumny, arrogance, levity. All theſe evils iſſue from within, and pollute the man.
24 *Then he aroſe and went to the frontiers of Tyre and Sidon; and having* Mat. 15; 21.
entered a houſe, he deſired that none might know of him; but he could not
25 *be concealed. For a woman, whoſe little daughter had an unclean ſpirit,*
26 *hearing of him came and threw herſelf at his feet (the woman was a Greek, a native of Syrophenicia), and entreated him, that he would caſt*
27 *the demon out of her daughter. Jeſus anſwered,* Let the children firſt be ſatisfied; for it is not ſeemly to take the children's bread, and
28 throw it to the dogs. *She replied,* True, Sir, yet even the dogs
29 under the table eat of the children's crumbs. *He ſaid to her,* For
30 this anſwer go home; the demon is gone out of thy daughter. *Immediately ſhe went home, and found her daughter lying upon the bed, and freed from the demon.*
31 *Then leaving the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he returned to the ſea of*
32 *Galilee, through the precincts of Decapolis. And they brought to him a deaf man, who had alſo an impediment in his ſpeech, and entreated him*
33 *to lay his hand upon him. Jeſus having taken him aſide from the crowd, ſpat upon his fingers, and put them into the man's ears, and touched his*
34 *tongue. Then looking up to heaven, and ſighing, he ſaid,* Ephphatha,
35 *that is, Be opened. Immediately his ears were opened, and his tongue*
36 *looſed, and he ſpoke diſtinctly. Jeſus charged them to tell nobody: but the more he charged them, the more they publiſhed it, ſaying, with inex-*
37 *preſſible amazement,* He doth every thing well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to ſpeak.

VIII. *At that time the crowd being very numerous, and having no food,* Mat. 15; 32.
2 *Jeſus called his diſciples, and ſaid to them,* I have compaſſion on the multitude; for they have attended me now three days, and have
3 nothing to eat; and if I ſend them home faſting, their ſtrength will
4 fail by the way; for ſome of them are come from afar. *His diſciples anſwered,* Whence can we ſupply theſe people with bread here in the
5 deſert? *He aſked them,* How many loaves have ye? *They ſaid,* Seven.
6 *Then commanding the multitude to place themſelves upon the ground, he took the ſeven loaves, and having given thanks, broke them, and gave them to his diſciples, that they might diſtribute them to the people, and*
7 *they diſtributed them. They had alſo a few ſmall fiſhes, which, after*
8 *the bleſſing, he likewiſe ordered to be preſented. So they ate, and were ſatisfied; and the fragments which remained were carried off in ſeven*
9 *maunds. Now they who had eaten were about four thouſand.*
10 *Having diſmiſſed them, he immediately embarked with his diſciples,*
11 *and went into the territory of Dalmanutha. Thence ſome Phariſees came,* Mat. 16; 1.
who began to argue with him, and, in order to prove him, demanded of
him

12 *him a ſign in the ſky. Jeſus anſwered, with a deep groan,* Wherefore
doth this generation require a ſign? Verily I ſay unto you, that no
13 ſign ſhall be given to this generation. *After that, leaving them, he reimbarked and returned.*

Mat. 16; 5. 14 *Now the diſciples had forgotten to bring bread, having only one loaf*
Lu. 12; 1. 15 *with them in the bark. Then Jeſus gave them this caution:* Attend;
beware of the leaven of the Phariſees, and of the leaven of Herod.
16 *They reflecting hereon, ſaid among themſelves:* It is becauſe we have no
17 bread. *Jeſus remarking it, ſaid unto them:* Why make ye this re-
flection, that ye have no bread? Are ye yet ſo thoughtleſs, ſo inat-
18 tentive? Is your underſtanding ſtill blinded? Have ye no uſe of your
19 eyes, or of your ears? or have ye no memory? When I diſtributed
the five loaves among the five thouſand, how many baſkets full of
20 fragments did ye carry off? *They anſwered,* Twelve. And when
the ſeven among the four thouſand, how many maunds full of frag-
21 ments did ye carry off? *They ſaid,* Seven. How then is it, *proceeded he,* that ye do not apprehend me?

22 *When Jeſus came to Bethſaida, they brought to him a blind man,*
23 *whom they entreated him to touch. He took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the village. Then having put ſpittle on his eyes, and*
24 *laid his hands upon him, he aſked him whether he ſaw. Having looked up, he ſaid,* I ſee men, whom I diſtinguiſh from trees only by their
25 walking. *And Jeſus laid his hands upon the man's eyes, and made him look again. And he was ſo perfectly cured, as to ſee every object*
26 *clearly. And Jeſus ſent him home, ſaying,* Neither go into the village, nor tell aught to any of the villagers.

SECTION V.

The Transfiguration.

Mat. 16; 13. 27 *JESUS went thence with his diſciples to the village of Ceſarea Philippi,*
Lu. 9; 18. *and by the way he aſked them, ſaying,* Who do men ſay that I am?
28 *They anſwered,* 'John the Baptiſt;' But ſome ſay, 'Elijah;' and
29 others, 'one of the Prophets.' *He ſaid to them,* But who ſay ye that
30 I am? *Peter anſwering, ſaid to him,* Thou art the Meſſiah. *Then he charged them to tell nobody this concerning him.*

Mat. 16; 21. 31 *And he began to inform them that the Son of Man muſt ſuffer many*
Lu. 9; 22. *things and be rejected by the elders, and the chief prieſts, and the ſcribes,*
32 *and be killed, and that in three days he muſt riſe again. This he ſpoke*
33 *ſo plainly, that Peter taking him aſide, reproved him. But he turning, and looking on his diſciples, rebuked Peter, ſaying,* Get thee hence,

adverſary, for thou doſt not reliſh the things of God, but the things of men.

34 *Then having called both to the people, and to his diſciples, he ſaid,* Is any man willing to come under my guidance? Let him renounce him- Mat. 16; 24. Lu. 9; 23. Jo. 12; 25.
35 ſelf, and take up his croſs, and follow me. For whoſoever would ſave his life, ſhall loſe it; and whoſoever will loſe his life, for my ſake
36 and the goſpel's, ſhall ſave it. What would it profit a man, if he
37 ſhould gain the whole world, with the forfeit of his life? or what
38 will a man not give in ranſom for his life? For whoſoever ſhall be Mat. 10; 33. Lu. 12; 9.
aſhamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and ſinful gene-
ration; of him likewiſe the Son of Man will be aſhamed, when he
ſhall come in the glory of his Father, accompanied by the holy
IX. meſſengers. *He added,* Verily I ſay unto you, there are ſome ſtanding here, who ſhall not taſte death till they ſee the reign of God uſhered in with power.

2 *AFTER ſix days Jeſus took Peter, and James, and John, apart* Mat. 17; 1. Lu. 9; 28.
to the top of a high mountain, and was transfigured in their preſence.
3 *His garments became radiant, and were like ſnow, of ſuch a whiteneſs, as*
4 *no fuller on the earth could imitate. There appeared to them alſo Elijah*
5 *and Moſes, who were converſing with Jeſus. Then Peter ſaid to Jeſus,* Rabbi, it is good for us to ſtay here: let us make three booths, one
6 for thee, and one for Moſes, and one for Elijah: *for he knew not*
7 *what he ſaid, they were ſo terrified. And there came a cloud which covered them; and out of the cloud iſſued a voice, which ſaid,* This is 2 Pet. 1; 17.
8 my beloved Son, hear him. *And inſtantly looking about, they ſaw nobody* ch. 1; 11. Mat. 3; 17. Lu. 3; 22.
but Jeſus and themſelves.
9 *As they went down from the mountain, he charged them not to relate* Mat. 17; 9.
to any body what they had ſeen, until the Son of Man were riſen from
10 *the dead. And they took notice of that expreſſion, and enquired among*
11 *themſelves what the riſing from the dead could mean. Then they aſked him,*
12 *ſaying,* Why do the ſcribes affirm, that Elijah muſt come firſt? *He anſwered,* Elijah, to conſummate the whole, muſt come firſt, and (as it is written of the Son of Man) muſt likewiſe ſuffer many things, and
13 be contemned. But I tell you, that Elijah too is come, as was predicted, and they have treated him as they pleaſed.

14 *WHEN he returned to the other diſciples, he ſaw a great multitude* Mat. 17; 14.
15 *about them, and ſome ſcribes diſputing with them. As ſoon as the people* Lu. 9; 37.
16 *ſaw him, they were all ſtruck with awe, and ran to ſalute him. And he*
17 *aſked the ſcribes,* About what do ye diſpute with them? *One of the people anſwering, ſaid,* Rabbi, I have brought thee my ſon, who
18 hath a dumb ſpirit; and whereſoever it ſeizeth him, it daſheth him

on the ground, where he continueth foaming, and grinding his teeth, till his ſtrength is exhauſted. And I ſpoke to thy diſciples to expel
19 the demon, but they were not able. *Jeſus thereupon ſaid*, O unbelieving generation; how long ſhall I be with you? How long ſhall
20 I ſuffer you? Bring him to me. *Accordingly they brought him: and no ſooner did Jeſus ſee him, than the ſpirit threw him into convulſions;*
21 *ſo that he foamed and rolled upon the ground. Jeſus aſked the father*, How long is it ſince this firſt befel him? *He anſwered*, From his
22 infancy; and often hath it thrown him both into the fire, and into the water, to deſtroy him; but if thou canſt do any thing, have com-
23 paſſion upon us, and help us. *Jeſus replied*, If thou canſt believe;
24 all things are practicable for him who believeth. *The boy's father crying out immediately, ſaid with tears*, I believe; maſter, ſupply thou
25 the defects of my faith. *When Jeſus ſaw that the people came crowding upon him, he rebuked the unclean ſpirit, ſaying to him*, Thou dumb and deaf ſpirit, come out of him, I command thee, and enter no more
26 into him. *Then the demon having cried aloud, and ſeverely convulſed him, came out, and he appeared as one dead, inſomuch that many ſaid,*
27 He is dead. *But Jeſus taking him by the hand, raiſed him, and he ſtood up.*

Mat. 17; 19. 28 *When Jeſus was come into the houſe, his diſciples aſked him privately,*
29 Why could not we expel the demon? *He anſwered*, This kind cannot be diſlodged, unleſs by prayer and faſting.

30 *Having left that place, they paſſed through Galilee, and he was deſirous that nobody ſhould know it. For he was inſtructing his diſciples.*

Mat. 17; 22. 31 *And he ſaid to them*, The Son of Man will ſoon be delivered into the hands of men, who will kill him; and after he is killed, he will riſe
32 again the third day. *But they underſtood not what he meant, and were afraid to aſk him.*

Mat. 18; 1. 33 *When he was come to Capernaum, being in the houſe, he aſked them,*
Lu. 9; 46. 34 What were ye debating amongſt yourſelves by the way? *But they were ſilent; for they had debated among themſelves by the way who ſhould*
35 *be greateſt. Then having ſat down, he called the twelve, and ſaid to them*, If any man, would be firſt, he ſhall be the laſt of all and the
36 ſervant of all. *And he took a child and placed him in the midſt of them,*
37 *and holding him in his arms, ſaid to them*, Whoſoever ſhall receive one ſuch child on my account, receiveth me; and whoſoever ſhall receive me, receiveth not me, but him who ſent me.

Lu. 9; 49. 38 *Then John ſaid to him*, Rabbi, we ſaw one expelling demons in thy name, who followeth not us, and we forbade him, becauſe he
39 doth not follow us. *Jeſus anſwered*, Forbid him not; for there is none who worketh a miracle in my name, that can readily ſpeak diſ-
40 reſpectfully of me. For whoever is not againſt you is for you.

For

41 For whoſoever ſhall give you a cup of water to drink on my ac- Mat. 10; 42.
count, becauſe ye are Chriſt's; verily I ſay unto you, he ſhall not
42 loſe his reward. But whoever ſhall enſnare any of the little ones Mat. 18; 6.
who believe in me, it were better for him that a millſtone were Lu. 17; 1.
43 faſtened to his neck, and that he were thrown into the ſea. More- Mat. 5; 29. & 18; 8.
over, if thy hand inſnare thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter If. 66; 24.
maimed into life, than having two hands to go into hell, into the un- Eccleſ. 7; 17.
44 quenchable fire; where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not Judith, 16; 17
45 quenched. And if thy foot inſnare thee, cut it off; it is better for
thee to enter lame into life, than having two feet to be caſt into hell,
46 into the unquenchable fire, where their worm dieth not, and their
47 fire is not quenched. And if thine eye inſnare thee, pull it out; it
is better for thee to enter one-eyed into the kingdom of God, than
48 having two eyes to be caſt into hell-fire; where their worm dieth not,
49 and their fire is not quenched: for every one ſhall be ſeaſoned with Lev. 2; 13.
50 fire; as every ſacrifice is ſeaſoned with ſalt. Salt is good; but if the Mat. 5; 13. Lu. 14; 34.
ſalt become taſteleſs, wherewith will ye ſeaſon it? Preſerve ſalt in
yourſelves, and maintain peace one with another.

X. *THEN he aroſe and came into the confines of Judea, through the* Mat. 19; 1.
country upon the Jordan. Again multitudes reſorted to him; and again,
as his cuſtom was, he taught them.
2 *And ſome Phariſees came who, to try him, aſked him,* Is it lawful for Mat. 19; 3.
3 the huſband to divorce his wife? *He anſwering, ſaid to them,* What
4 precept hath Moſes given you on this ſubject? *They replied,* Moſes Deut. 24; 1.
hath permitted us to write her a bill of divorcement, and diſmiſs her.
5 *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid to them,* Becauſe of your untractable diſpoſition,
6 Moſes gave you this permiſſion. But from the beginning, at the
7 creation, God made them a male and a female. For this reaſon a Gen. 1; 27. Eph. 5; 31.
man wall leave his father and mother, and ſhall adhere to his wife, Gen. 2; 24.
8 and they two ſhall be one fleſh. They are, therefore, no longer
two, but one fleſh. What God then hath conjoined, let not man
ſeparate.
10 *And in the houſe his diſciples aſked him anew concerning this matter.*
11 *He ſaid to them,* Whoſoever divorceth his wife and marrieth another, Mat. 5; 32.
12 committeth adultery againſt her; and if a woman divorce her huſband, Lu. 16; 18.
and marry another, ſhe committeth adultery.
13 *Then they brought children to him, that he might touch them; but the* Mat. 19; 13.
14 *diſciples rebuked thoſe who brought them. Jeſus perceiving this, was* Lu. 18; 15.
offended, and ſaid to them, Allow the children to come unto me, and
15 do not hinder them; for of ſuch is the kingdom of God. Verily I Mat. 18; 3.
ſay unto you, whoſoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a
child.

16 child, ſhall never enter it. *Then taking them up in his arms, and laying his hands upon them, he bleſſed them.*

Mat. 19; 16. Lu. 18; 18. 17 *As he went out into the road, one came running to him, who, kneeling, aſked him*, Good teacher, what muſt I do to inherit eternal life?

18 *Jeſus anſwered*, Why calleſt thou me good? God alone is good.

Ex. 20; 12. Deut. 5; 16. 19 Thou knoweſt the commandments: do not commit adultery; do not commit murder; do not ſteal; do not give falſe teſtimony; do

20 no injury; honour thy father and mother. *The other replied*, Rabbi,

21 I have obſerved all theſe from my childhood. *Jeſus looking upon him loved him, and ſaid to him*, In one thing, nevertheleſs, thou art deficient. Go, ſell all that thou haſt, and give the price to the poor, and thou ſhalt have treaſure in heaven; then come and follow me,

22 carrying the croſs. *But he was troubled at this anſwer, and went away ſorrowful; for he had great poſſeſſions.*

Mat. 19; 23. 23 *Then Jeſus looking around him, ſaid to his diſciples*, How difficult

Lu. 18; 24. 24 is it for the wealthy to enter the kingdom of God! *The diſciples were aſtoniſhed at his words: but Jeſus reſuming the diſcourſe, ſaid*, Children, how difficult is it for them who confide in wealth, to enter the king-

25 dom of God! It is eaſier for a camel to paſs through the eye of a

26 needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. *At this*

27 *they were ſtill more amazed, and ſaid one to another*, Who then can be ſaved? *Jeſus looking upon them, ſaid*, To men it is impoſſible, but not to God: for to God all things are poſſible.

Mat. 19; 27. 28 *Then Peter took occaſion to ſay*, As for us, we have forſaken all, and

Lu. 18; 28. 29 followed thee. *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid*, Verily I ſay unto you, there is none who ſhall have forſaken his houſe, or brothers, or ſiſters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my ſake and the

30 goſpel's; who ſhall not receive now in this world a hundred-fold, houſes, and brothers, and ſiſters, and mothers, and children, and

Lu. 13; 30. 31 lands, with perſecutions, and in the future ſtate eternal life. But many ſhall be firſt who are laſt, and laſt who are firſt.

SECTION VI.

The Entry into Jeruſalem.

32 *AS they were on the road to Jeruſalem, Jeſus walking before them,* Mat. 20; 17.
a panic ſeized them, and they followed him with terror. Then Lu. 18; 31.
33 *taking the twelve aſide, he told them again what would befal him.* Behold, *ſays he,* we are going to Jeruſalem, where the Son of Man
ſhall be delivered to the chief prieſts, who will condemn him to die,
34 and conſign him to the Gentiles; who will mock him, and ſcourge
him, and ſpit upon him, and kill him; but the third day he ſhall riſe
again.
35 *Then James and John, the ſons of Zebedee, accoſted him, ſaying,* Mat. 20; 20.
36 Rabbi, we beg thou wouldſt grant us what we propoſe to aſk. *He*
37 *ſaid to them,* What would you have me grant you? *They anſwered,*
That when thou ſhalt have attained thy glory, one of us may ſit at
38 thy right hand, and the other at thy left. *Jeſus replied,* Ye know
not what ye aſk. Can ye drink ſuch a cup as I am to drink; and
39 undergo an immerſion like that which I muſt undergo? *They anſwered,*
We can. *Jeſus ſaid to them,* Ye ſhall indeed drink ſuch a cup as I
am to drink; and undergo an immerſion like that which I muſt
40 undergo: but to ſit at my right hand, and at my left, I cannot give,
unleſs to thoſe for whom it is appointed.
41 *The ten hearing this, conceived indignation againſt James and John.* Mat. 20; 24.
42 *But Jeſus having called them together, ſaid to them,* Ye know that
thoſe who are accounted the princes of the nations domineer over
43 them; and their great ones exerciſe their authority upon them: but Lu. 22; 24.
it muſt not be ſo amongſt you. On the contrary, whoſoever would
44 be great amongſt you, ſhall be your ſervant; and whoſoever would
45 be the chief, ſhall be the ſlave of all. For even the Son of Man
came not to be ſerved, but to ſerve, and to give his life a ranſom for Phil. 2; 7.
many.
46 *Then they came to Jericho. Afterwards, as he was departing thence* Mat. 20; 29.
with his diſciples, and a great crowd, blind Bartimeus, ſon of Timeus, Lu. 18; 35.
47 *who ſat by the way-ſide begging, hearing that it was Jeſus the Nazarene,*
48 *cried, ſaying,* Jeſus, thou Son of David, have pity upon me. *Many*
charged him to be ſilent, but he cried ſtill the louder, Son of David,
49 have pity upon me. *Jeſus ſtopping, ordered them to call him. Ac-*
cordingly they called the blind man, ſaying to him, Take courage, ariſe,
50 he calleth thee. *Then throwing down his mantle, he ſprang up, and*
51 *went to Jeſus. Jeſus addreſſing him, ſaid,* What doſt thou with me

to do for thee? Rabboni, *answered the blind man*, to give me my sight.
52 *Jesus said to him*, Go; thy faith hath cured thee. *Immediately he recovered his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.*

Mat. 21; 1. Lu. 19; 29. XI. *As they approached Jerusalem, being come as far as Bethphage and*
2 *Bethany, near the mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples, and said to them*, Go into the village over against you, and just as ye enter
it, ye will find a colt tied, whereon no man ever rode; loose him,
3 and bring him. And if any body ask you, 'Wherefore do ye this?' say, 'The master needeth him,' and he will instantly send him hither.
4 *Accordingly they went, and finding the colt tied before a door, where two*
5 *ways met, they loosed him. Some of the people present said to them,*
6 Wherefore loose ye the colt? *They having answered as Jesus had com-*
Jo. 12; 12. 7 *manded them, were allowed to take him. Accordingly they brought the colt to Jesus, whereon having laid their mantles, Jesus sat upon him.*
8 *And many spread their mantles in the way; others cut down sprays from*
9 *the trees, and strewed them in the way. And they who went before,*
Ps. 118; 25. *and they who followed, shouted, saying*, Hosanna (*i*)! blessed be he
10 that cometh in the name of the Lord (*k*). Happy be the approaching
11 reign of our father David. Hosanna (*l*) in the highest heaven. *In this manner Jesus entered Jerusalem and the temple; where, after surveying every thing around, he, as it was late, departed with the twelve to Bethany.*

Mat. 21; 18. 12. *On the morrow, when he left Bethany, he was hungry; and observing a fig-tree at a distance, full of leaves, went to look for fruit on it, for the fig-harvest was not yet. And being come, he found nothing but leaves.*
14 *Thereupon Jesus said to it*, Henceforth let never man eat fruit off thee. *And his disciples heard him.*

Mat. 21; 12. Jo. 2; 14. Lu. 19; 45. 15 *Being returned to Jerusalem, Jesus went into the temple, and drove out them who sold, and them who bought in the temple, and overturned the tables of the money-changers, and the stalls of them who sold doves;*
Is. 56; 7. Jer. 7; 11. 16 *and would suffer nobody to carry vessels through the temple. He also taught them, saying*, Is it not written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations?" but ye have made it a den of robbers.
18 *And the Scribes and the chief priests hearing this, sought means to destroy him; for they dreaded him, because all the multitude admired his doctrine.*
19 *And in the evening he went out of the city.*

Mat. 21; 20. 20 *Next morning as they returned, they saw that the fig-tree was dried*
21 *up from the root. Peter recollecting, said to him*, Rabbi, behold the
22 fig-tree which thou hast devoted, already withered. *Jesus answered*,
23 Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, Whoever shall say to this mountain, 'Be lifted and thrown into the sea,' and shall not in

(*i*) *Save now I pray.* (*k*) *Jehovah.* (*l*) *Save now I pray.*

in the leaſt doubt, but ſhall believe that what he ſaith ſhall happen;
24 whatever he ſhall command ſhall be done for him: for which reaſon
I aſſure you, that what things ſoever ye pray for, if ye believe that ye
ſhall obtain them, they ſhall be yours.
25 And when ye ſtand up to pray, forgive, if ye have matter of com- Mat. 6; 14.
plaint againſt any; that your Father who is in heaven may alſo forgive
26 you your treſpaſſes. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Mat. 18; 35.
Father, who is in heaven, forgive your treſpaſſes.
27 *Again, they arrived at Jeruſalem, and as he was walking in the* Mat. 21; 23.
28 *temple, the chief prieſts, the ſcribes, and the elders, came and ſaid to* Lu. 20; 1.
him, By what authority doſt thou theſe things? and who empowered
29 thee to do them? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them*, I alſo have a
queſtion to aſk; anſwer me, and I will tell you by what authority I
30 do theſe things. Was the title which John had to baptize, from
31 heaven, or from men? anſwer me. *Then they argued thus among*
32 *themſelves: 'If we ſay, From heaven; he will reply, Why then did ye*
not believe him? But if we ſay, from men; we are in danger from the Mat. 14; 5.
33 *people, who are all convinced that John was a Prophet.' They therefore*
anſwering, ſaid to Jeſus. We cannot tell. *Jeſus replied,* Neither tell
I you by what authority I do theſe things.
XII. *Then addreſſing them in parables, he ſaid*, A man planted a vineyard, Mat. 21; 33.
and hedged it about, and dug a place for the wine vat, and built a Lu. 20; 9.
2 tower, and having farmed it out, went abroad. The ſeaſon being
come, he ſent a ſervant to the huſbandmen, to receive his portion
3 of the fruits of the vineyard. But they ſeized him, beat him, and
4 ſent him away empty. Again, he ſent to them another ſervant,
whom they wounded in the head with ſtones, and ſent back with diſ-
5 grace. Again, he ſent another, whom they killed; and of many
6 more that he ſent, ſome they beat, and ſome they killed. At laſt,
having an only ſon, whom he loved, he ſent him alſo to them; for
7 he ſaid, 'They will reverence my ſon.' But thoſe huſbandmen ſaid
among themſelves, 'This is the heir, come, let us kill him; and the
8 'inheritance will be our own.' Then they laid hold on him, and
9 having thruſt him out of the vineyard, killed him. What, therefore,
will the proprietor of the vineyard do? He will come and deſtroy the
10 huſbandmen, and give the vineyard to others. Have ye not read this Pſ. 118; 22.
paſſage of Scripture. "A ſtone which the builders rejected, is made Acts, 4; 11.
11 "the head of the corner. This the Lord (*m*) hath performed, and 1 Pet. 2; 6.
12 "we behold it with admiration." *Then they would fain have ſeized*
him, but were afraid of the multitude; for they knew that he ſpoke the
parable againſt them.

SECTION

(*m*) *Jehovah.*

SECTION VII.

The Prophecy on Mount Olivet.

Mat. 20; 17. Lu. 20; 20. 13 14 *LEAVING him they went away, and ſent to him certain Phariſees and Herodians (n), to catch him in his words. Theſe coming up, ſaid to him,* Rabbi, we know that thou art upright, and ſtandeſt in awe of none; for thou reſpecteſt not the perſon of men, but teacheſt the way of God faithfully. Is it lawful to give tribute to Ceſar, or 15 not? Shall we give? or ſhall we not give? *He perceiving their artifice, anſwered,* Why would ye entangle me? Bring me a denarius, 16 that I may ſee it. *When they had brought it, he aſked them,* Whoſe is 17 this image and inſcription? *They anſwered,* Ceſar's. *Jeſus replied,* Render to Ceſar that which is Ceſar's, and to God that which is God's. *And they wondered at him.*

Mat. 22; 23. Lu. 20; 27. Acts, 23; 8. Deut. 25; 5. 18 19 *Then came Sadduces to him, who ſay that there is no future life, and propoſed this queſtion:* Rabbi, Moſes hath enacted, that if a man's brother die, ſurvived by a wife without children, he ſhall marry the 20 widow, and raiſe iſſue to his brother. Now there were ſeven brothers. 21 The firſt took a wife, and dying, left no iſſue. The ſecond married 22 her, and died; neither left he any iſſue; ſo did alſo the third. Thus all the ſeven married her, and left no iſſue. Laſt of all the woman 23 alſo died. At the reſurrection, therefore, when they are riſen, to which of the ſeven will ſhe belong; for ſhe hath been wife to them 24 all? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them,* Is not this the ſource of your 25 error, your not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God? For there will be neither marrying, nor giving in marriage among them who riſe from the dead. They will then reſemble the heavenly 26 meſſengers. But as to the dead, that they are quickened, have ye Ex. 3; 6. not read in the book of Moſes, how God ſpoke to him in the buſh, ſaying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the 27 "God of Jacob." God is not a God of the dead, but of the living. Therefore ye greatly err.

Mat. 22; 35. Lu. 10; 25. Deut. 6; 4. 28 29 *A ſcribe who had heard them diſpute, perceiving the juſtneſs of his reply, came to him, and propoſed this queſtion:* Which is the chief commandment of all? *Jeſus anſwered,* The chief of all the commandments is, "Hearken, Iſrael, the Lord (o) is our God: the 30 "Lord (p) is one;" and, "Thou ſhalt love the Lord (q) thy God "with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul, and with all thy mind,

(n) *Partizans of Herod.* (o) *Jehovah.* (p) *Jehovah.* (q) *Jehovah.*

31 " and with all thy ſtrength." This is the firſt commandment. The ſecond reſembleth it: " Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf." Lev. 19; 18.
32 There is no commandment greater than theſe. *The ſcribe replied*, Truly, Rabbi, thou haſt anſwered well. There is one God, and
33 only one; and to love him with all the heart, and with all the ſpirit, and with all the ſoul, and with all the ſtrength; and to love one's neighbour as one's ſelf, is more than all burnt-offerings and ſacrifices.
34 *Jeſus obſerving how pertinently he had anſwered, ſaid to him*, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. *After that, nobody ventured to put queſtions to him.*
35 *As Jeſus was teaching in the temple, he aſked them*, Why do the Mat. 22; 41.
36 ſcribes aſſert that the Meſſiah muſt be a ſon of David? Yet David himſelf, ſpeaking by the Holy Spirit, ſaith, " The Lord (*r*) ſaid to " my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footſtool." Lu. 20; 41. Pſ. 110; 1.
37 David himſelf, therefore, calleth him his Lord, how then can he be his ſon? *And the common people heard him with delight.*
38 *Further, in teaching he ſaid to them*, Beware of the ſcribes, who Mat. 23; 6.
39 affect to walk in robes, who love ſalutations in public places, and the principal ſeats in the ſynagogues, and the uppermoſt places at enter- Lu. 11; 43. & 20; 46.
40 tainments, who devour the families of widows, and uſe long prayers for a diſguiſe. Theſe ſhall undergo the ſevereſt puniſhment.
41 *And Jeſus ſitting over againſt the treaſury, obſerved the people threw-* Lu. 21; 1.
42 *ing money into the treaſury: and many rich perſons put in much. Then came a poor widow, who threw in two mites, which make a farthing (s).*
43 *Jeſus having called his diſciples, ſaid to them*, Verily I ſay unto you, that this poor widow hath given more than any of thoſe who have
44 thrown into the treaſury: for they all have contributed out of their ſuperfluous ſtore; whereas ſhe hath given all the little that ſhe had, her whole living.

XIII. *AS he was going out of the temple, one of the diſciples ſaid to him*, Mat. 24; 1.
Rabbi, look what prodigious ſtones and ſtately buildings are here! Lu. 19; 44. & 21; 5.
2 *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid to him*, Thou ſeeſt theſe great buildings. They ſhall all be ſo razed, that one ſtone will not be left upon another.
3 *Afterwards, as he was ſitting on the Mount of Olives, over againſt* Mat. 24; 3.
the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, aſked him pri- Lu. 21; 7.
4 *vately*, Tell us, when will this happen? And what will be the ſign
5 when all this is to be accompliſhed? *Jeſus anſwering them, took occa-*
6 *ſion to ſay*, Take heed that no man ſeduce you: for many will aſſume my character, ſaying, 'I am the perſon,' and will ſeduce many.
7 But when ye hear of wars, and rumours of wars, be not alarmed; for this muſt happen, but the end is not yet.

(*r*) *Jehovah.* (*s*) *Leſs than an Engliſh farthing.*

Mat. 24; 7. Lu. 21; 10. Mat. 10; 17. Jo. 16; 2.
8 For nation will ariſe againſt nation, and kingdom againſt kingdom; and there will be earthquakes in ſundry places; and there will be
9 famines and commotions. Theſe are the prelude of woes. But take head to yourſelves; for they will deliver you to councils; and ye will be beaten in the ſynagogues, and brought before governors and
10 kings for my ſake, to bear teſtimony to them. The good tidings,
Lu. 12; 11. 11 however, muſt firſt be publiſhed amongſt all nations. But when they conduct you, to deliver you up, have no anxiety beforehand, nor premeditate what ye ſhall ſpeak; but whatever ſhall be ſuggeſted to you in that moment, ſpeak; for it is not ye that ſhall ſpeak, but
12 the Holy Spirit. Then the brother will deliver up the brother to death; and the father the child; and children will ariſe againſt
13 their parents, and procure their death. And on my account ye ſhall be hated univerſally; but the man who perſevereth to the end ſhall be ſaved.

Mat. 24; 15. Lu. 21; 20. Dan. 9; 26.
14 But when ye ſhall ſee, in an unſuitable place, the deſolating abomination foretold by the Prophet Daniel *(Reader attend!)* then let
15 thoſe in Judea flee to the mountains; and let not him who ſhall be on the roof, go down into the houſe, nor enter it, to carry any thing
16 out of his houſe; and let not him who ſhall be in the field, turn back
17 to fetch his mantle. But woe to the women with child, and to them
18 who give ſuck in thoſe days. Pray then that your flight happen not
19 in the winter; becauſe there ſhall be ſuch affliction in thoſe days, as hath not been before from the beginning of the world which God
20 created, nor ſhall be ever after. Had the Lord aſſigned it a long duration, no ſoul could eſcape; but for the ſake of the people whom he hath elected, he hath made its duration the ſhorter.

Mar. 24; 23. Lu. 17; 23. & 21; 8.
21 Then if any one ſhall ſay to you, 'Lo! the Meſſiah is here,'
22 or, 'Lo! he is yonder,' believe it not. For falſe meſſiahs and falſe prophets will ariſe, who will perform wonders and prodi-
23 gies, in order to impoſe, if poſſible, even on the elect. Be ye therefore upon your guard: remember, I have warned you of every thing.

Mat. 24; 29. Lu. 21; 25. If. 13; 10. Ezek. 32; 7. Joel, 2; 10, 31. & 3; 15. Rev. 1; 7.
24 But in thoſe days, after that affliction, the ſun ſhall be darkened,
25 and the moon ſhall withhold her light; and the ſtars of heaven ſhall
26 fall; and the powers which are in heaven ſhall be ſhaken. Then they ſhall ſee the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and
27 glory. Then he will ſend his meſſengers, and aſſemble his elect from the four quarters of the world, from the extremities of heaven and earth.

Mat. 24; 32. Lu. 21; 29.
28 Learn now a ſimilitude from the fig-tree. When its branches become tender, and put forth leaves, ye know that the ſummer is nigh.
29 In like manner, when ye ſhall ſee theſe things happen, know that he
30 is near, even at the door. Verily I ſay unto you, that this generation

31 tion ſhall not paſs until all theſe things be accompliſhed. For heaven
and earth ſhall fail; but my words ſhall not fail.
32 But of that day, or of that hour knoweth none (not the heavenly Mat. 24; 42.
33 meſſengers, no not the Son) but the father. Be circumſpect, be
34 vigilant, and pray; for ye know not when that time will be. When
a man intendeth to travel, he leaveth his houſehold in charge to his
ſervants, aſſigneth to every one his taſk, and ordereth the porter to
35 watch. Watch ye therefore; for ye know not when the maſter of
of the houſe will return, whether in the evening (*t*), or at mid-
36 night (*u*), or at cockcrowing (*x*), or in the morning (*y*), leſt coming
37 ſuddenly he find you aſleep. Now, what I ſay unto you, I ſay unto
all, Watch.

SECTION VIII.

The laſt Supper.

XIV. *AFTER two days was the feaſt of the paſſover, and of unleavened* Mat. 26; 1.
bread. And the chief prieſts and the ſcribes were contriving Lu. 22; 1.
2 *how they might take Jeſus by ſurprize, and kill him. They ſaid how-* Jo. 11; 47, 53.
ever, Not during the feſtival, for fear of an inſurrection among the
people.
3 *Now being at table in Bethany, in the houſe of Simon [formerly] a leper,* Mat. 26; 6.
there came a woman who had an alabaſter box of the balſam of ſpikenard, Jo. 11; 2. & 12; 2.
which was very coſtly: and ſhe broke open the box, and poured the liquor
4 *upon his head. There were ſome preſent who ſaid, with ſecret indigna-*
5 *tion*, Why this profuſion of the balſam? For it could have been
ſold for more than three hundred denarii (*z*), which might have
6 been given to the poor. *And they murmured againſt her. But Jeſus*
ſaid, Let her alone. Why do ye moleſt her? She hath done me a
7 good office. For ye will have the poor always amongſt you, and can Deut. 15; 11.
do them good whenever ye pleaſe; but me ye will not always have.
8 She hath done what ſhe could. She hath beforehand embalmed
9 my body for the funeral. Verily I ſay unto you, in whatſoever
corner of the world the goſpel ſhall be preached, what this woman
hath now done ſhall be mentioned to her honour.
10 *Then Judas Iſcariot, one of the twelve, repaired to the chief prieſts,* Mat. 26; 14.
11 *to betray Jeſus to them. And they liſtened to him with joy, and promiſed* Lu. 22; 3.
to give him money. Afterwards he ſought a favourable opportunity to
deliver him up.

Now

(*t*) Nine afternoon. (*u*) Twelve. (*x*) Three in the morning. (*y*) Six.
(*z*) Upwards of 9*l.* ſterling.

Mat. 26; 17. Lu. 22; 7.
12 *Now the firſt day of unleavened bread, when the paſſover is ſacrificed,*
his diſciples ſaid to him, Whither ſhall we go to prepare for thy eating
13 the paſſover? *Then he ſent two of his diſciples, ſaying to them,* Go into
the city, where ye will meet a man carrying a pitcher of water, follow
14 him; and wherever he ſhall enter, ſay to the maſter of the houſe,
'The teacher ſaith, Where is the gueſt-chamber, in which I may
15 'eat the paſſover with my diſciples?' And he will ſhow you a large
16 upper room, ready furniſhed, there prepare for us. *Accordingly, his*
diſciples went away, and being come into the city, found every thing as
he had told them, and prepared the paſſover.

Mat. 26; 20. Lu. 22; 21. Jo. 13; 21.
17 *In the evening he went thither with the twelve. As they were at*
table eating, Jeſus ſaid, Verily I ſay unto you, that one of you who
19 eateth with me, will betray me. *Upon this they became very ſorrowful,*
20 *and aſked him, all of them, one after another,* Is it I? *He anſwering,*
Pſ. 41; 9. *ſaid to them,* It is one of the twelve, he who dippeth his morſel in the
21 diſh with me. The Son of man departeth in the manner foretold in
Scripture concerning him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son
of Man is betrayed: it had been better for that man never to have been
born.

Mat. 26; 26. Lu. 22; 14. 1Cor. 11; 23.
22 *While they were at ſupper, Jeſus took bread, and after the bleſſing,*
broke it, and gave it to them, ſaying, Take, eat, this is my body.
23 *Then he took the cup, and having given thanks, gave it to them: and*
24 *they all drank of it. And he ſaid to them,* This is my blood, the blood
25 of the new covenant, ſhed for many. Verily I ſay unto you, that I
will drink no more of the product of the vine, until that day when I
26 ſhall drink it new in the kingdom of God. *And after the hymn they*
went out to the mount of Olives.

Mat. 26; 31. Jo. 16; 32. Zech. 13; 7. ch. 16; 7
27 *And Jeſus ſaid to them,* This night I ſhall prove a ſnare to you all;
for it is written, "I will ſmite the ſhepherd; and the ſheep ſhall be
28 "diſperſed." Nevertheleſs, after I am raiſed again, I will go before
29 you to Galilee. *Peter then ſaid to him,* Though they all ſhould be
30 inſnared, I never will. *Jeſus anſwered him,* Verily I ſay unto thee,
that to-day, this very night, before the cock crow twice, even thou
31 wilt diſown me thrice. *But Peter inſiſted on it, adding,* Although
I ſhould die with thee, I never will diſown thee. *And all the reſt ſaid*
the ſame.

Mat. 26; 36. Lu. 22; 40
32 *Then they came to a place named Gethſemane, where he ſaid to his*
33 *diſciples,* Stay here while I pray. *And he took with him Peter, and*
34 *James, and John, and being ſeized with grief and horror, ſaid to them,*
My ſoul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguiſh; tarry here and
35 watch. *And going a little before, he threw himſelf on the ground, and*
prayed that, if it were poſſible, he might be delivered from that hour,
36 *and ſaid,* Abba *(that is, Father),* all things are poſſible to thee;
take this cup away from me; yet not what I would, but what thou

37 wilt. *Then he returned, and finding them aſleep, ſaid to Peter*, Simon,
38 ſleepeſt thou? Couldſt thou not keep awake a ſingle hour? Watch
and pray that ye be not overcome by temptation: the ſpirit indeed
39 is willing, but the fleſh is weak. *Again, he retired and prayed, uſing*
40 *the ſame words. When he returned, he again found them ſleeping; for*
their eyes were overpowered, and they knew not what to anſwer him.
41 *A third time he came and ſaid to them*, Sleep on now, and take your
reſt: all is over: the hour is come: and the Son of Man is conſigned
42 to the hands of ſinners. Ariſe. Let us be going. Lo! he who be-
trayeth me is drawing near.

43 *Immediately, ere he had done ſpeaking, appeared Judas, one of the* Mat. 26; 47. Lu. 22; 47.
twelve, with a great multitude armed with ſwords and clubs, who Jo. 18; 3.
44 *were ſent by the chief prieſts, the ſcribes and the elders. Now the*
betrayer had given them this ſignal: The man whom I ſhall kiſs is he;
45 ſeize him, and lead him away ſafely. *He was no ſooner come, than*
46 *accoſting Jeſus, he ſaid*, Rabbi, Rabbi, *and kiſſed him. Then they*
47 *laid hands on him, and ſeized him. But one of thoſe who were preſent*
drew his ſword, and ſmiting the high prieſt's ſervant, cut off his ear.
48 *Then Jeſus addreſſing them, ſaid*, Do ye come with ſwords and
49 clubs to apprehend me, like people in purſuit of a robber? I was
daily amongſt you teaching in the temple; and ye did not arreſt me.
50 But hereby the Scriptures are accompliſhed. *Then they all forſook*
him and fled.

51 *Now there followed him a youth who had only a linen cloth wrapped*
52 *about his body; the ſoldiers having laid hold on him, he left the cloth,*
and fled from them naked.

SECTION IX.

The Crucifixion.

53 *THEN they took Jeſus away to the high prieſt, with whom all the* Mat. 26; 57.
54 *chief prieſts, the elders and the ſcribes were convened. And Peter* Lu. 22; 54.
followed him at a diſtance, as far as the court of the high prieſt's houſe, Jo. 18; 13, 24.
and ſat there with the officers, warming himſelf at the fire.

55 *Meanwhile the chief prieſts and all the Sanhedrim ſought for evidence* Mat. 26; 59.
56 *againſt Jeſus, in order to condemn him to die, but found none: for* Lu. 22; 66.
many gave falſe teſtimony againſt him, but their teſtimonies were inſuffi-
57 *cient. Then ſome aroſe who teſtified falſely againſt him, ſaying*, We Jo. 2; 19.
heard him ſay, 'I will demoliſh this temple made with hands, and
59 in three days will build another without hands.' *But even here their*
60 *teſtimony was defective. Then the high prieſt, ſtanding up in the midſt,*
interrogated Jeſus ſaying, Doſt thou anſwer nothing to what theſe

61 men teſtify againſt thee? *But he was ſilent, and gave no anſwer.*
Again, the high prieſt interrogating him, ſaid, Art thou the Meſſiah,
62 the Son of the bleſſed one? *Jeſus anſwered,* I am; nay, ye ſhall ſee
the Son of Man ſitting at the right hand of the Almighty, and coming
63 in the clouds of heaven. *Then the high prieſt rent his garments, ſaying,*
64 What further need have we for witneſſes? Ye have heard the blaſphe-
my. What is your opinion? *And they all pronounced him worthy of*
65 *death. Then ſome began to ſpit on him; others to cover his face and*
buffet him, ſaying to him, Divine who it is. *And the officers gave him*
blows on the cheeks

Mat. 26; 69. Lu. 22; 55. Jo. 18; 17. & 25.
66 *Now Peter being below in the court, one of the maid-ſervants of the*
67 *high prieſt came thither, who ſeeing Peter warming himſelf, looked on*
68 *him, and ſaid,* Thou alſo waſt with the Nazarene Jeſus. *But he de-*
nied, ſaying, I know him not: nor do I underſtand what thou
meaneſt. *Immediately he went out into the portico, and the cock crew.*
69 *The maid ſeeing him again, ſaid to the ſtanders-by,* This is one of them.
70 *Again he denied. And a little after, thoſe who were preſent ſaid to*
Peter, Thou art certainly one of them; for thou art a Galilean, thy
71 ſpeech ſhoweth it. *Upon this he affirmed, with imprecations and oaths,*
72 *that he did not know the man of whom they ſpake. Then the cock crew*
the ſecond time: and Peter recollected the word which Jeſus had ſaid to
ch. 14; 30. *him,* "*Before the cock crow twice, thou wilt diſown me thrice.*" *And*
he reflected thereon with tears.

Mat. 27; 1. Lu. 23; 1. Jo. 18; 28.
XV. *EARLY in the morning, the chief prieſts, with the elders, the*
ſcribes, and all the Sanhedrim, after conſulting together, bound Jeſus,
carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate.

Mat. 27; 11. Lu. 23; 3.
2 *Pilate aſking him, ſaid,* Thou art the king of the Jews? *He an-*
3 *ſwered,* Thou ſayeſt right. *Now the chief prieſts accuſed him of many*
4 *things. Again Pilate aſked him, ſaying,* Anſwereſt thou nothing?
5 Obſerve how many crimes they arraign thee for. *But Jeſus anſwered*
no more, inſomuch that Pilate was aſtoniſhed.

Mat. 27; 15. Lu. 23; 17. Jo. 18; 39.
6 *Now at the feſtival, he always releaſed to them any one priſoner whom*
7 *they deſired. And there was one Barabbas that had been impriſoned*
with his ſeditious aſſociates, who in their ſedition had committed murder.
8 *And with clamour the multitude demanded of Pilate what he uſed to grant*
9 *them. He anſwered them, ſaying,* Shall I releaſe to you the king of
10 the Jews? *(For he knew that through envy the chief prieſts had de-*
11 *livered him up.) But the chief prieſts incited the multitude to inſiſt on*
12 *the releaſe of Barabbas in preference to Jeſus. Pilate again interpoſed,*
ſaying, What then would ye have me do with him whom ye call king
13 of the Jews? *They cried again,* Crucify him. *Pilate aſked them,*
Why? What evil hath he done? *But they cried the more vehemently,*
15 Crucify him. *Then Pilate, deſirous to gratify the crowd, releaſed*
Barabbas

Barabbas to them, and having cauſed Jeſus to be ſcourged, delivered him up to be crucified.

16 *And the ſoldiers brought him into the hall called pretorium (a), where* Mat 27; 27.
17 *having convened all the band, they arrayed him in purple, and crowned* Jo. 19; 1.
18 *him with a wreath of thorns, and ſaluted him, ſaying,* Hail, king of
19 the Jews! *Then they ſtruck him on the head with a reed, and ſpat*
20 *upon him, and paid him homage on their knees. And when they had mocked him, they ſtripped him of the purple, and dreſſed him in his own clothes, and took him away to be crucified.*

21 *And they conſtrained one Simon a Cyrenian, who paſſed by, in coming* Mat. 27; 32.
from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to carry the Lu. 23; 26,
22 *croſs. And they brought him to Golgotha, that is to ſay, the place of* & 33.
23 *ſculls, where they gave him wine to drink, mingled with myrrh, which* Jo. 19; 17.
24 *he would not receive. When they had nailed him to the croſs, they parted* Jo. 19; 23.
25 *his garments, dividing by lot what every one ſhould take. Now it was*
26 *the third hour (b) when they nailed him to the croſs. And the inſcription, bearing the cauſe of his death, was in theſe words, THE KING*
27 *OF THE JEWS. They likewiſe crucified two robbers with him, one*
28 *at his right hand, the other at his left. And that Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith, "He was ranked among malefactors."* Iſ. 53; 12.

29 *Meantime they who paſſed by reviled him, ſhaking their heads, and* Mat. 27; 39.
ſaying, Ah! thou who demoliſheſt the temple, and rebuildeſt it in Lu. 23; 35.
30 three days; ſave thyſelf, and come down from the croſs. *The chief*
prieſts likewiſe, with the ſcribes, deriding him, ſaid among themſelves,
32 He ſaved others; cannot he ſave himſelf? Let the Meſſiah, the king of Iſrael, deſcend now from the croſs, that we may ſee and believe. *Even thoſe who were crucified with him, reproached him.*

33 *Now from the ſixth hour (c) until the ninth (d), darkneſs covered* Mat. 27; 45.
34 *all the land. At the ninth hour (e), Jeſus cried aloud, ſaying,* Eloi, Lu. 23; 44.
Eloi, lamma ſabachthani? *which ſignifieth, "My God, my God, why* Pſ. 22; 1.
35 *"haſt thou forſaken me?" Some who were preſent, hearing this, ſaid,*
36 Hark! he calleth Elijah. *One at the ſame time ran and dipped a ſponge in vinegar, and having faſtened it to a ſtick, preſented it to him to drink, ſaying,* Let alone, we ſhall ſee whether Elijah will come
37 to take him down. *And Jeſus ſending forth a loud cry, expired.*

38 *Then was the veil of the temple rent in two, from top to bottom.* Mat. 27; 51.
39 *And the centurion who ſtood over againſt him, obſerving that he expired* Lu. 23; 45.
with ſo loud a cry, ſaid, Surely this man was the Son of a God.

40 *There were women alſo looking on at a diſtance, amongſt whom* Mat. 27; 55.
were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger, Lu. 23; 55.
and Lu. 8; 2.

(a) *The governor's palace,* or hall of audience.
(b) Nine in the morning.
(c) Twelve noon.
(d) Three afternoon.
(e) Three afternoon.

41 *and of Joſes and Salome (theſe had followed him, and ſerved him, when he was in Galilee), and ſeveral others who came with him to Jeruſalem.*

SECTION X.

The Reſurrection.

Mat. 27; 57. Lu. 23; 50. Jo. 19; 38.

42 *WHEN it was evening (becauſe it was the preparation (f), that is,*
43 *the eve of the Sabbath (g), Joſeph of Arimathea, an honourable ſenator, who himſelf alſo expected the reign of God, taking courage,*
44 *repaired to Pilate, and begged the body of Jeſus. Pilate, amazed that he was ſo ſoon dead, ſent for the centurion, and aſked him whether Je-*
45 *ſus had been dead any time. And being informed by the centurion, he*
46 *granted the body to Joſeph; who having bought linen, and taken Jeſus down, wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a monument, hewn*
47 *out of the rock, and rolled a ſtone to the entrance. Now Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joſes, ſaw where he was laid.*

Mat. 28; 1. Lu. 24; 1. Jo. 20; 1.

XVI. *WHEN the Sabbath was paſt, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought ſpices, that they might embalm him.*
2 *And early in the morning, the firſt day of the week (h), they came to*
3 *the monument about ſunriſe. And they ſaid among themſelves,* Who will roll away the ſtone for us from the entrance of the monument?
4 *(for it was very large). But when they looked, they ſaw that the ſtone*
5 *had been rolled away. Then entering the monument, they beheld a youth ſitting on the right ſide, clothed in a white robe, and they were fright-*
6 *ened. But he ſaid to them,* Be not frightened; ye ſeek Jeſus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He is riſen: he is not here: behold
7 the place where they laid him. But go, ſay to his diſciples, and to Peter, 'He is gone before you to Galilee; where ye ſhall ſee him,
8 'as he told you.' *The women then getting out, fled from the monument, ſeized with trembling and conſternation; but ſaid nothing to any one, they were ſo terrified.*

Jo. 20; 14.

9 *Jeſus having riſen early the firſt day of the week, appeared firſt to*
10 *Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had caſt ſeven demons. She went and informed thoſe who had attended him, who were in affliction and*
11 *tears. But when they heard that he was alive, and had been ſeen by her, they did not believe it.*

Afterwards

(f) Friday. (g) Saturday. (h) Sunday.

12 *Afterwards he appeared in another form to two of them, as they tra-* Lu. 24; 13.
13 *velled on foot into the country. Theſe being returned, acquainted the reſt; but neither did they believe them.*

14 *At length he appeared to the eleven, as they were at meat, and re-* Lu. 24; 36.
proached them with their incredulity and obſtinacy in diſbelieving thoſe Jo. 20; 19.
15 *who had ſeen him after his reſurrection. And he ſaid unto them,* Go Mat. 28; 19.
throughout all the world, proclaim the good tidings to the whole
16 creation. He who ſhall believe, and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved;
but he who will not believe ſhall be condemned. And theſe mira-
17 culous powers ſhall attend the believers. In my name they ſhall
18 expel demons. They ſhall ſpeak languages unknown to them be- Acts, 16; 18
fore. They ſhall handle ſerpents [with ſafety]. And if they drink Acts, 2; 4. & 10; 46.
poiſon, it ſhall not hurt them. They ſhall cure the ſick, by laying Act., 28; 5.
their hands upon them. Acts, 28; 8.

19 *NOW after the Lord had ſpoken to them, he was taken up into heaven,*
20 *and ſat down at the right hand of God. As for them, they went out* Heb. 2; 4.
and proclaimed the tidings every where, the Lord co-operating with them, and confirming their doctrine by the miracles wherewith it was accompanied.

PREFACE

TO

LUKE's GOSPEL.

LUKE, to whom this Goſpel, the third in order, has been, from the earlieſt eccleſiaſtical antiquity, uniformly attributed, was, for a long time, a conſtant companion of the Apoſtle Paul, and aſſiſtant in preaching the Goſpel, as Mark is ſaid to have been of the Apoſtle Peter. Of Luke we find honourable mention made once and again in Paul's Epiſtles (*a*). But the moſt of what we can know of his hiſtory, muſt be collected from the Acts of the Apoſtles, a book alſo written by him in continuation of the hiſtory contained in the Goſpel. Though the Author, like the other Evangeliſts, has not named himſelf as the author, he has ſignified plainly in the introduction of his work, that he is not an apoſtle, nor was himſelf a witneſs of what he atteſts, but that he had his intelligence from apoſtles and others who attended our Lord's miniſtry upon the earth.

§ 2. IT has been made a queſtion whether he was originally a Jew or a Pagan. The latter opinion has been inferred from an expreſſion of the Apoſtle Paul to the Coloſſians (*b*), where, after naming ſome with this addition, *who are of the circumciſion*, he mentions others, and among them Luke, without any addition. Theſe are, therefore, ſuppoſed to have been Gentiles. But this, though a plauſible inference, is not a neceſſary conſequence from the Apoſtle's words. He might have added the clauſe, *who are of the circumciſion*, not to diſtinguiſh the perſons from thoſe after mentioned as *not of the circumciſion*, but to give the Coloſſians particular information concerning thoſe with whom perhaps they had not previouſly been acquainted. If they knew what Luke, and Epaphras, and Demas, whether Jews or Gentiles, originally were, the information was quite unneceſſary with regard to them. It will perhaps add a little to the weight of this conſideration to obſerve that in

(*a*) Col. iv. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24. (*b*) Chap. iv. 10—14.

in thoſe days, in introducing to any church ſuch Chriſtian brethren as were unknown to them before, it was a point of ſome importance to inform them whether they were of the circumciſion or not, inaſmuch as there were certain ceremonies and obſervances wherein the Jewiſh converts were indulged, which, if found in one converted from Gentiliſm, might render it ſuſpected that his converſion was rather to Judaiſm than to Chriſtianity.

§ 3. SOME ancients, on the contrary, have imagined that he was not only a Jew, but one of the Seventy, commiſſioned by our Lord to preach the Goſpel (*c*). This, I think, may be confuted from what is advanced by Luke himſelf, who does not pretend to have been a witneſs of our Lord's miracles and teaching; but to have received his information from witneſſes. This would not have been done by one who had attended our Lord's miniſtry, and was, though not an apoſtle, of the number of his diſciples. I am not ignorant that Whitby (*d*), after others, has attempted ſo to explain the words as to make what is ſaid concerning the information received from witneſſes, to relate only to thoſe who had publiſhed their narratives before that time, and that the phraſe παρηκολουθηκοτι ανωθεν πασιν ακριβως, is intended for marking the diſtinction between their ſource of intelligence and his. In my opinion, he has totally miſtaken the import of this clauſe, as I ſhall ſhow in explaining the place (*e*). But that our Evangeliſt was, with all the other writers of the New Teſtament, a convert to Chriſtianity from Judaiſm, not from Gentiliſm, is, upon the whole, ſufficiently evident from his ſtyle, in which, notwithſtanding its greater copiouſneſs and variety, there are as many Hebraiſms as are found in the other Evangeliſts, and ſuch as, I imagine, could not be exemplified in any writer, originally Gentile, unleſs his converſion to Judaiſm had been very early in life.

§ 4. FURTHER, Luke ſeems to have had more learning than any of the other Evangeliſts. And if he be the perſon mentioned in the above cited paſſage of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians (*f*) of which I ſee no reaſon to doubt; he was by profeſſion *a phyſician*. Grotius has hence inferred ſeveral particulars which, as they are not ſupported by any poſitive proofs, can be ranked only among conjectures. The reaſon which Luke himſelf aſſigned for his writing was, it would appear, to prevent people's giving, without examination or inquiry, too eaſy credit to the narratives of the life of Jeſus, which at that time ſeem to have abounded. I acknowledge that the word επεχειρησαν, *have undertaken*, uſed here by Luke, does not neceſſarily imply any blame laid on the execution; but the ſcope of the place ſeems to imply it, if not on all, at leaſt on ſome of thoſe undertakings: for if all, or even moſt, were well executed, the number was an argument rather againſt a new attempt than for it. The very circumſtance of the number of ſuch narratives at ſo early a period is itſelf an evidence that there was ſomething in the firſt publication of the Chriſtian doctrine, which, notwithſtanding the many unfavourable circumſtances, wherewith it was attended, excited

(*c*) Luke, x. 1.
(*d*) Preface to the Goſpel of St. Luke.
(*e*) Chap. i. 3. N
(*f*) Chap. iv. 14.

excited the curioſity and awakened the attention of perſons of all ranks and denominations; inſomuch that every narrative which pretended to furniſh men with any additional information concerning ſo extraordinary a perſonage as Jeſus, ſeems to have been read with avidity.

§ 5. WHO they were to whom the Evangeliſt alludes, who had, from vague reports, raſhly publiſhed narratives not entirely to be depended on, it is impoſſible for us now to diſcover. Grotius juſtly obſerves, that the ſpurious Goſpels mentioned by ancient writers, are forgeries manifeſtly of a later date. He ſeems to except the Goſpel according to the Egyptians, which, though much earlier than the reſt, can ſcarcely claim an antiquity higher than that according to Luke. That there were, however, ſome ſuch performances at the time that Luke began to write, the words of this Evangeliſt are ſufficient evidence: for, to conſider this book merely on the footing of a human compoſition, what writer of common ſenſe would introduce himſelf to the public by obſerving the numerous attempts that had been made by former writers, ſome of whom at leaſt had not been at due pains to be properly informed, if he himſelf were actually the firſt, or even the ſecond or the third, who had written on the ſubject; and if one of the two who preceded him, had better opportunities of knowing than he, and the other fully as good? But the total diſappearance of thoſe ſpurious writings, probably no better than haſty collections of flying rumours, containing a mixture of truth and falſehood, may, after the genuine Goſpels were generally known and read, be eaſily accounted for. At midnight the glimmering of a taper is not without its uſe; but it can make no conceivable addition to the light of the meridian ſun. And it deſerves to be remarked by the way, that whatever may be thought to be inſinuated here by the Evangeliſt, concerning the imperfect information of former hiſtorians, there is no hint given of their bad deſign.

§ 6. SOME have inferred from Luke's introduction, that his muſt have been the firſt genuine Goſpel that was committed to writing. In my opinion this would need to be much more clearly implied in the words than it can be ſaid to be, to induce a reaſonable critic to adopt an opinion ſo repugnant to the uniform voice of antiquity. The remark of Grotius on this head appears to have more weight than is commonly allowed it. Luke, he obſerves, wrote in Greek, Matthew's Goſpel had been written in the Hebrew of the times, and probably was not then tranſlated into Greek. The expreſſion of Papias implies, in my opinion, as was hinted already (*g*), that that Goſpel remained a conſiderable time without any written tranſlation into Greek. If ſo, the only authentic Goſpel which had preceded Luke's in Greek, was the Goſpel by Mark, which comparatively was but a compend.

§ 7. LUKE

(*g*) Preface to Matthew's Goſpel, § 6.

§ 7. LUKE, in compoſing this Goſpel, is ſuppoſed by ſome to have drawn his information chiefly from the Apoſtle Paul whom he faithfully attended, as Mark did his from the Apoſtle Peter. They even proceed ſo far as to ſuppoſe that when Paul, in his Epiſtles, uſes the expreſſion *my Goſpel, (b)*, he means the Goſpel according to Luke: but nothing can be more unnatural than this interpretation. That Paul, who was divinely enlightened in all that concerned the life and doctrine of his Maſter, muſt have been of very great uſe to the Evangeliſt, cannot be reaſonably doubted; yet, from Luke's own words, we are led to conclude, that the chief ſource of his intelligence, as to the facts related in his Goſpel, was from thoſe who had been eye- and ear witneſſes of what our Lord both did and taught. Now of this number Paul evidently was not. But, though Luke appears to have been an early and aſſiduous attendant on the miniſtry of that Apoſtle, and to have accompanied him regularly in his apoſtolical journies, from his voyage to Macedonia, till he was carried priſoner to Rome, whither alſo the Evangeliſt went along with him, he could not fail to have many opportunities, both before and after joining him, of converſing with thoſe Apoſtles and other diſciples who had heard the diſcourſes, and ſeen the miracles, of our Lord.

§ 8. As to the time when this Goſpel was written, hardly any thing beyond conjecture has yet been produced. The ſame may be ſaid of the place of publication. Jerom thinks it was publiſhed in Achaia, when Paul was in that country, attended by Luke; and by the computation of Euthymius, it was fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion; but Paul's journey into Achaia could not have been ſo early. Grotius ſuppoſes that both the Goſpel and the Acts were written ſoon after Paul left Rome, to travel into Spain. His principal reaſon ſeems to have been, becauſe the latter of theſe hiſtories ends nearly about that time, to wit, when Paul was firſt a priſoner at Rome. But though this may be admitted to be a very ſtrong preſumption, that the Acts of the Apoſtles were compoſed then, it affords no ſort of evidence that the Goſpel may not have been compoſed and publiſhed long before. That it actually was ſome time before the other, appears to me the more probable ſuppoſition of the two. By the introduction to the Goſpel, where the author particularly addreſſes himſelf to his friend Theophilus, his whole intention at that time appears to have been to give a hiſtory of our Lord's life, teaching, and miracles. And even in concluding the Goſpel, no hint is given of any continuation or further hiſtory then in view. Again, in the beginning of the Acts, when he addreſſes the ſame friend, he ſpeaks of the Goſpel as of a treatiſe which he had compoſed on a former occaſion, and which was then well known. And as to the place of publication, though nothing certain can be affirmed concerning it, I am inclined to think it more probable that it was Antioch, or at leaſt ſome part of Syria, if not Paleſtine. Every thing here ſeems addreſſed to thoſe who were well acquainted with Jewiſh cuſtoms and places. No hints

(*b*) Rom. ii. 16. xvi. 25. 2 Tim. ii. 8.

hints are inſerted, by way of Explanation, as we find in the Goſpels of Mark and John.

§ 9. BUT though no certainty can be had about the preciſe time and place of publication, we have, in regard to the Author, the ſame plea of the uniform teſtimony of Chriſtian antiquity, which was pleaded in favour of the preceding Evangeliſts, Matthew and Mark. Some indeed have thought that, as an Evangeliſt, Luke has the teſtimony of Paul himſelf, being, as they ſuppoſe, *the brother whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel*, mentioned in one of his Epiſtles (*i*). But admitting that Luke is the perſon there intended, another meaning may, with greater plauſibility, be put on the expreſſion *in the Goſpel*, which rather denotes in preaching the Goſpel, than in writing the hiſtory of its Author. The name Evangeliſt was firſt applied to thoſe extraordinary miniſters, ſuch as Philip and Timothy, both expreſsly called ſo (*k*), who attended the Apoſtles, and aſſiſted them in their work. Luke was doubtleſs an Evangeliſt in this ſenſe, as well as in the current, but later, acceptation of the term. Lardner has taken notice of alluſions to ſome paſſages in this Goſpel to be found in ſome of the apoſtolic fathers; and there are evident quotations from it, though without naming the author, in Juſtin Martyr, and the Epiſtle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. Tatian, a little after the middle of the ſecond century, compoſed a Harmony of the Goſpels, the firſt of the kind that had been attempted, which he called DIATESSARON (διὰ τεσσάρων) *of the four*, and which demonſtrates that, at that time, there were four Goſpels, and no more, of eſtabliſhed authority in the church. Irenæus, not long after, mentions all the Evangeliſts by name, arranging them according to the order wherein they wrote, which is the ſame with that univerſally given them, throughout the Chriſtian world, to this day. When ſpeaking of Luke, he recites many particulars which are peculiar to that Goſpel. And though the reaſons aſſigned by that ancient author, why the Goſpels can be neither fewer, nor more, than four, we ſhould juſtly conſider as very whimſical; the attempt, though unſucceſsful, to account for it, ſhows at leaſt the certainty of the fact, that the four Goſpels were then received by Chriſtians of all denominations, and that beſide them there was no goſpel or hiſtory of Jeſus, of any eſtimation in the church. From that time downwards, the four Evangeliſts are often mentioned; and whatever ſpurious narratives have from time to time appeared, they have not been able to bear a compariſon with thoſe, in reſpect either of antiquity or of intrinſic excellence. Early in the third century, Ammonius alſo wrote a Harmony of the four Goſpels. As theſe were at that time, and had been from their firſt publication, ſo they continue to this day to be, regarded as the great foundations of the Chriſtian faith. If Monſieur Freret had been ſo lucky as to meet with Lardner's Credibility of the Goſpel-hiſtory, and had taken the trouble to read it attentively before he wrote his *Examen Critique*, his natural penetration muſt have made him ſenſible, not-

(*i*) 2 Cor. viii. 18. (*k*) Acts, xxi. 8. 2 Tim. iv. 5.

notwithſtanding the artleſs ſimplicity of the Engliſh writer, how little his own much laboured remarks can bear a compariſon with the naked truth.

§ 10. The Goſpel by Luke has ſupplied us with many intereſting particulars, which had been omitted by both his predeceſſors, Mathew and Mark. From him we learn whatever relates to the birth of John the Baptiſt; the annunciation; and other important circumſtances concerning the nativity of the Meſſiah; the occaſion of Joſeph's being then in Bethlehem; the viſion granted to the ſhepherds; the early teſtimony of Simeon and Anna; the wonderful manifeſtation of our Lord's proficiency in knowledge, when only twelve years old; his age at the commencement of his miniſtry, connected with the year of the reigning emperor. He has given us alſo an account of ſeveral memorable incidents and cures which had been overlooked by the reſt; the converſion of Zaccheus the publican; the cure of the woman who had been bowed down for eighteen years; and of the dropſical man; the cleanſing of the ten lepers; the repulſe he met with when about to enter a Samaritan city; and the inſtructive rebuke he gave, on that occaſion, to two of his diſciples, for their intemperate zeal: alſo the affecting interview he had, after his reſurrection, with two of his diſciples, in the way to Emmaus, and at the village. Luke has likewiſe added many edifying parables to thoſe which had been recorded by the other Evangeliſts. Of this number are the parable of the creditor who had two debtors; of the rich fool who hoarded up his increaſe, and, when he had not one day to live, vainly exulted in the proſpect of many happy years; of the rich man and Lazarus; of the reclaimed profligate; of the phariſee and the publican praying in the temple; of the judge who was prevailed on by a widow's importunity, though he feared not God, nor regarded man; of the barren fig-tree; of the compaſſionate Samaritan; and ſeveral others; moſt of which, ſo early a writer as Irenæus has ſpecified as peculiarly belonging to this Goſpel; and has thereby ſhown to all after-ages, without intending it, that it is, in every thing material, the ſame book, which had ever been diſtinguiſhed by the name of this Evangeliſt till his day, and remains ſo diſtinguiſhed to ours.

§ 11. In regard to Luke's character as a writer, it is evident, that though the ſame general quality of ſtyle, an unaffected ſimplicity, predominates in all the Evangeliſts; they are, nevertheleſs, diſtinguiſhable from one another. Luke abounds in Hebraiſms as much as any of them; yet it muſt be acknowledged, that there are alſo more Greciſms in his language than in that of any of the reſt. The truth is, there is greater variety in his ſtyle, which is probably to be aſcribed to this circumſtance, his having been more, and for a longer time, converſant among the Gentiles than any other Evangeliſt. His ordinary place of abode, if not the place of his birth, appears to have been Antioch, the capital of Syria, the ſeat of government, where people of the firſt diſtinction in the province had their reſidence, and to which there was great reſort of ſtrangers. Here the Greek language had long prevailed. Beſides, Luke's occupation, as a phyſician, may very probably

probably

have occaſioned his having greater intercourſe with thoſe of higher rank. Not that the profeſſion itſelf was then in great eſteem in that country; for it has been juſtly obſerved, that in Rome, as well as in Syria, ſlaves who gave early ſigns of quickneſs of parts and manual dexterity, were often inſtructed in phyſic, who, if they proved ſucceſsful, were commonly rewarded with their freedom. That Luke himſelf, whatever may have been his early condition in life, was, when a Chriſtian miniſter, a freeman and maſter of his time, is evident from his attendance on the Apoſtle Paul in his peregrinations for the advancement of the Goſpel. But the profeſſion of medicine and ſurgery (for theſe two were then commonly united) not only proved the occaſion of a more general intercourſe with ſociety, but ſerved as a ſtrong inducement to employ ſome time in reading. This may ſufficiently account for any ſuperiority this Evangeliſt may be thought to poſſeſs above the reſt, in point of language.

§ 12, His name, Λουκας, *Luke*, in one place *(l)*, in the common tranſlation, rendered Lucas, is ſuppoſed to have been a contraction of the Roman name *Lucillius*, or of *Lucanus*, in like manner as *Demas* is contracted from *Demetrius*, and *Epaphras* from *Epaphroditus*. Names thus contracted from the maſter's name were commonly given to ſlaves, but not peculiarly to ſuch. That a conſiderable portion of Luke's time had been ſpent in Rome, or at leaſt in Italy, has been argued from ſome Latiniſms diſcovered in his ſtyle; ſuch as *(m)*, δος εργασιαν, *da operam, endeavour*; and καλως ποιειτε τοις μισουσιν υμας, *(n)*, *Benefacite his qui oderunt vos*, with the dative caſe, *Do good to them who hate you*; whereas, in the parallel place in Matthew *(o)*, the verb is conſtrued more in the Greek manner with the accuſative, καλως ποιειτε τους μισουντας υμας. But I ſee no reaſon why, in the Evangeliſt Luke, by birth a Syrian, this ſhould be accounted a Latiniſm rather than a Syriaſm, as in Syriac the ל prefixed (which is neceſſary in the expreſſion of this precept) is always conſidered as correſponding to the dative in Greek and Latin. That he has alſo a greater variety in his words and phraſes than any of the other Evangeliſts, will be quickly diſcovered by an attentive reader of the original. I mention one evidence of this, from a circumſtance I have had particular occaſion to attend to, which is this: Each of the Evangeliſts has a conſiderable number of words which are uſed by none of the reſt, but in Luke's Goſpel, the number of ſuch peculiarities, or words uſed in none of the other Goſpels, is greater than that of the peculiar words found in all the three other Goſpels put together. Again, ſome expreſſions which are frequent in the other Goſpels, in Luke occur but rarely. The Hebrew word *Amen*, as an affirmative adverb joined with λεγω υμιν, and uſed for uſhering in ſolemnly the inſtructions given by our Lord, is employed by Luke much ſeldomer than by any of the other Evangeliſts. Inſtead of it he ſometimes ſays αληθως, ſometimes ναι, and once επ' αληθειας λεγω υμιν, phraſes never uſed by the reſt. On the other hand, he oftner than they, employs the neuter article το, in reference not to a noun, but to a

 ſentence,

(*l*) Philem. 24.
(*m*) Ch. xii. 58.
(*n*) Ch. vi. 27.
(*o*) Matth. v. 44.

ſentence, or part of a ſentence. Of this there are at leaſt ſeven inſtances in his Goſpel (*p*). I recollect but two in the reſt, one in Matthew (*q*), and one in Mark (*r*). As to theſe two, they are not parallel places to any of the paſſages wherein this mode of conſtruction has been adopted by Luke. It may be obſerved, in paſſing, that the terms peculiar to Luke are for the moſt part long and compound words. The firſt word of his Goſpel, πυκνότερον, is of the number. So much for what regards his words and idioms.

§ 13. As to the other qualities of his ſtyle, we may remark, that there is more of compoſition in the ſentences than is found in the other three. Of this the very firſt ſentence is an example, which occupies no leſs than four verſes. In the paſſages, however, wherein thoſe incidents are related, or thoſe inſtructions given, which had been anticipated by Matthew or by Mark, there is ſometimes, not always, a perfect coincidence with theſe Evangeliſts in the expreſſion, as well as in the ſenſe; ſometimes, however, the coincidence in tranſlations is more complete than in the original. I have obſerved that there are degrees, even in the ſimplicity of the ſacred writers; for though all the Evangeliſts are eminent for this quality, there are ſome characteriſtic differences between one and another, which will not eſcape the notice of a reader of diſcernment. Matthew and John have more ſimplicity than Mark; and Luke has, perhaps, the leaſt of all. What has been obſerved of the greater variety of his ſtyle, and of his more frequent uſe of complex ſentences, may ſerve as evidence of this. And even as to the third ſpecies of ſimplicity formerly mentioned (*s*), ſimplicity of deſign, he ſeems to approach nearer the manner of other hiſtorians, in giving what may be called his own verdict in the narrative part of his work. I remember at leaſt one inſtance of this. In ſpeaking of the Phariſees, he calls them φιλάργυροι (*t*), *lovers of money*. The diſtinction with regard to Judas, which it was proper in them all to obſerve, as there were two of the name among the Apoſtles, is expreſſed by Luke with more animation (*u*), ος και εγενετο προδοτης, *who proved a traitor*, than by Matthew (*v*), who ſays, ὁ και παραδους αυτον; or by Mark (*w*), whoſe expreſſion is, ὁς και παρεδωκεν αυτον; both which phraſes, ſtrictly interpreted, imply no more than *who delivered him up*. The attempt made by the Phariſees, to extort from our Lord what might prove matter of accuſation againſt him, is expreſſed by Luke in language more animated than is uſed by any of the reſt, ἠρξαντο δεινως ενεχειν, και αποστοματιζειν αυτον περι πλειονων (*x*), *began vehemently to preſs him with queſtions on many points*. On another occaſion, ſpeaking of the ſame people, he ſays, Αυτοι δε επλησθησαν ανοιας (*y*), *But they were filled with madneſs*. In the moral inſtructions given by our Lord, and recorded by this Evangeliſt, eſpecially in the parables, none can be happier in uniting an affecting ſweetneſs of manner with genuine

(*p*) Luke, i. 62. ix. 46. xxii. 2. 4. 23, 24. 37.
(*q*) Matth. xix. 18.
(*r*) Mark, ix. 23.
(*s*) Diſſ. III. § 18, &c.
(*t*) Ch. xvi. 14.
(*u*) Ch. vi. 16.
(*v*) Ch. x. 4.
(*w*) Ch. iii. 19.
(*x*) Ch. xi. 53.
(*y*) Ch. vi. 11.

genuine ſimplicity. Of this union better inſtances cannot be imagined, than thoſe of the humane Samaritan, and of the penitent prodigal.

§ 14. To conclude, though we have no reaſon to conſider Luke as, upon the whole, more obſervant of the order of time than the other Evangeliſts, he has been at more pains than any of them, to aſcertain the dates of ſome of the moſt memorable events on which, in a great meaſure, depend the dates of all the reſt. In ſome places, however, without regard to order, he gives a number of detached precepts and inſtructive leſſons, one after another, which probably have not been ſpoken on the ſame occaſion, but are introduced as they occurred to the writer's memory, that nothing of moment might be forgotten. In regard to the latter part of the life, and to the death of this Evangeliſt, antiquity has not furniſhed us with any accounts which can be relied on.

CONTENTS.

LUKE's GOSPEL.

INTRODUCTION.

CH. I. 1—4. *Page* 389

SECTION I.

THE ANNUNCIATION.

CH. I. 5—56.

THE conception and birth of John the Baptiſt, announced from heaven to his father Zacharias in the temple:—Zacharias doubting, receives for a ſign that he ſhould be ſpeechleſs till the fulfilment of the prediction;—returns home with his wife Elizabeth, who after conceiving, lives ſome months in retirement:—the immaculate conception and birth of Jeſus announced to his virgin mother, by the ſame heavenly meſſenger:—Mary's viſit to her couſin Elizabeth:—Elizabeth's joy, and prophecy on the ſight of Mary:—Mary's hymn of thankſgiving and triumph. *Ibid.*

SECTION II.

THE NATIVITY.

CH. I. 57, &c. II. 1—40.

The birth of John;—his circumciſion;—the emperor's edict for regiſtering the people, occaſions Mary's journey to Bethlehem;—there ſhe bears Jeſus;—the tidings announced by an angel to ſhepherds;—their viſit to the infant at Bethlehem;—Jeſus is circumciſed;—afterwards, at Mary's purification, preſented to the Lord as a firſt-born male;—the prophecy of Simeon on that occaſion,—and of Anna. 392

SECTION III.

THE BAPTISM.

CH. II. 41, &c. III. IV. 1—13.

Jeſus, in tender age, diſcuſſes ſome queſtions with the rabbies;—is ſubject to his parents:—John ſent to baptize and admoniſh the people, announcing the Meſſiah;—the bad treatment he receives from Herod:—Jeſus baptized and atteſted from heaven;—his genealogy from Adam;—he is tempted by the devil. 394

SECTION IV.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

CH. IV. 14, &c. V. VI. 1—11.

Jeſus teaches in Galilee with applauſe;—explains, in the ſynagogue of Nazareth, a prediction of Iſaiah:—the people offended, attempt to throw him down a precipice;—he eſcapes their fury;—expels a demon at Capernaum;—cures Peter's wife's mother of a fever;—performs many other cures;—announces the reign of God in the ſynagogues of Galilee;—from a bark belonging to Peter, teaches the people on the ſhore;—by an extraordinary draught of fiſhes, prefigures the ſucceſs of his apoſtles as fiſhers of men;—cleanſes a leper, and heals a paralytic carried on a bed;—is charged with blaſphemy;—calls Matthew;—eats with publicans;—vindicates this conduct;—alſo that of his diſciples in not faſting;—clears from breach of Sabbath, himſelf for curing on that day,—and them for plucking and rubbing the ears of corn, induced by hunger. 397

SECT.

SECTION V.

The Nomination of Apostles.

CH. VI. 12, &c. VII. 1—35.

Jesus selects his twelve apostles;—afterwards, attended by a great multitude, teaches who are truly happy;—that we ought to love all men, and do good to all, enemies not excepted;—warns against uncharitableness in judging others;—partiality in judging ourselves;—the evidence that a man is good, is his actions, not his professions;—the insignificancy of the latter without the former:—Jesus cures a centurion's servant;—at Nain restores to life a widow's son:—John's message to Jesus;—testimony of Jesus concerning John;—the people's opinion of both. *Page* 401

SECTION VI.

Signal Miracles and Instructions.

CH. VII. 36, &c. VIII. IX. 1—17.

A woman of a bad life anoints the feet of Jesus in the house of a Pharisee;—whom being scandalized at his permitting it, Jesus instructs in the extent of divine mercy and its happy consequences;—travels about teaching and warning in cities and villages, attended by the twelve and some pious women:—the parable of the sower;—reason for using parables;—the explanation:—a lamp not lighted but to enlighten:—knowledge not given but to be communicated:—who are considered by Jesus as his dearest relatives;—he embarks;—meets with a tempest;—stills it by a word;—lands;—cures the demoniac who had the legion;—and a woman of a bloody issue;—the daughter of Jairus restored to life:—Jesus sends the twelve, empowering them to cure diseases:—Herod's doubts concerning Jesus;—Jesus feeds 5000 in the desert. 404

SECTION VII.

The Transfiguration.

CH. IX. 18. &c. X.

Different opinions concerning Jesus;—Peter acknowledges him to be the Messiah:—Jesus foretells his own death and resurrection;—all who would be followers, must prepare for suffering:—Jesus transfigured in the presence of Peter and Zebedee's sons;—cures a demoniac;—again foretells that he will be delivered to his enemies;—humility the road to preferment in the reign of heaven;—the meanest disciple not to be despised;—the services of those who do not accompany the Apostles, not to be rejected:—Jesus sets out for Jerusalem;—is refused admittance into a Samaritan city on the road;—the vindictive proposal of two disciples rejected by their Master, with a severe reprimand to the proposers:—those who would follow Jesus must do it at all hazards, and without delay:—the mission of the Seventy:—the aggravation of the guilt of those who, though they had enjoyed the ministry of Jesus, and seen his miracles, remained impenitent:—the return and report of the Seventy:—Jesus is consulted by a lawyer as to what must be done to obtain eternal life;—he explains, by the parable of the humane Samaritan, the meaning of *neighbour*:—in the example of Martha and her sister Mary, we are taught what is the most important pursuit. 408

SECTION VIII.

The Character of the Pharisees.

CH. XI. XII.

Jesus gives his disciples a model of prayer;—enjoins importunity;—cures a dumb demoniac;—refutes the plea of the Pharisees, that by the aid of demons he expelled demons;—points out the true happiness of man:—Jonah the only sign that would be granted to that generation;—their obduracy and folly contrasted to the penitence of the Ninevites, and the queen of Sheba's love of wisdom:—a Pharisee, at whose house Jesus dines, scandalized at his not washing his hands before dinner:—Jesus reproaches the Scribes and Pharisees, with being more solicitous about cleansing the outside than the inside;—with exactness in things of little moment, whilst they

they neglected things of the greateſt;—with affecting pre-eminence in every thing;—with hypocriſy;—with impoſing burdens on others from which they keep themſelves free;—with perſecuting the prophets when living, and pretending to honour them when dead;—with obſtructing the people's entry into the kingdom of God:—he warns his diſciples of their dangerous doctrine;—fortifies them againſt the dread of their power;—reminds them of the care of Providence;—and of the greatneſs of their future recompenſe:—the danger of apoſtacy;—and of detracting from the Holy Spirit:—warning againſt covetouſneſs, from the example of a rich fool who exulted in his ſtores, and knew not that he had a day to live:—againſt anxiety:—incitements to vigilance and activity:—the doctrine of Jeſus the occaſion of contention and diviſion:—men attentive and judicious in temporal affairs, often careleſs and injudicious in ſpiritual concerns.

Page 412

SECTION IX.

The Nature of the Kingdom.

CH. XIII. XIV.

Sudden and violent deaths not evidences of greater guilt in individuals, but general warnings to reformation:—the ſimilitude of the barren fig-tree:—an infirm woman cured on the Sabbath:—the ſimilitude of the grain of muſtard ſeed;—and of the leaven:—ſalvation demands our utmoſt vigilance and exertion:—in ſpite of Herod's deſigns upon him, Jeſus would go about ſafely for a ſhort time, and then finiſh his courſe at Jeruſalem;—his lamentation over that impenitent and devoted city:—a dropſical man cured in a Phariſee's houſe on the Sabbath:—a warning againſt forwardneſs and vanity:—admonition to entertain the needy rather than the wealthy:—parable of the ſupper to which the invited refuſed to come:—the neceſſity of deliberation before we engage in the Meſſiah's ſervice, illuſtrated from the example of a prudent builder;—and of a king at war. 418

SECTION X.

Parables.

CH. XV. XVI.

The loſt ſheep;—the loſt drachma;—the prodigal ſon;—the unjuſt, but provident ſteward;—the uſe men make of temporal things here, marks their fitneſs for the truſt of ſpiritual things hereafter:—admonitions againſt avarice;—hypocriſy;—reliance on the judgment of men;—againſt divorce:—the utmoſt exertion requiſite to ſecure a place in the kingdom of heaven:—the rich man and Lazarus. 421

SECTION XI.

Inſtructions and Warnings.

CH. XVII. XVIII. XIX. 1—27.

Nothing more dangerous than to inſnare:—the method of treating an offending brother:—the power of faith:—obedience to the Creator, gives no claim on his favour:—the cure of ten lepers, of whom only one, a Samaritan, proves grateful:—the reign of God not introduced with outward ſhow:—the coming to judgement ſudden and unexpected, like the deluge, and the deſtruction of Sodom:—that diſciple is fortified againſt danger who prefers his Maſter to every earthly thing:—the parable of the importunate widow and the unjuſt judge:—the devotions of the Phariſee and of the publican compared:—the people encouraged to bring their children to Jeſus:—what muſt be done to obtain eternal life:—how far the deſire of perfection would lead us:—riches a great obſtacle to men's admiſſion into the kingdom:—the reward of them who abandon any thing for Jeſus;—his death and reſurrection foretold;—the cure of a blind beggar:—the converſion of Zaccheus:—the parable of the pounds. 424

SECTION XII.

The Entry into Jeruſalem.

CH. XIX. 28, &c. XX. XXI. 1—4.

Jeſus rides into the city on an aſs, the multitude accompanying him with ſhouts;—laments the obduracy of the city, and foretells its fate;—drives the traffickers out of the temple;—ſilences the chief prieſts and others who

who queſtioned his authority:—the parable of the huſbandmen who ill-treated and killed their landlord's meſſengers:—foretells the rejection of the Jews, and the admiſſion of the Gentiles into the church:—eludes the craft of the Phariſees who queſtion him on the lawfulneſs of paying tribute to Ceſar:—vindicates the reſurrection againſt the Sadducees:—puzzles the Phariſees about the meaning of an expreſſion in the Pſalms:—warns his hearers againſt the vanity and arrogance of the Scribes:—teaches that charity is to be rated more by the ability of the giver than by the greatneſs of the gift. *Page* 428

SECTION XIII.

The LAST SUPPER.

CH. XXI. 5, &c. XXII. 1—53.

The deſtruction of the temple foretold:—the calamities by which it would be preceded:—the ſigns that judgement is nigh:—the puniſhment of the wicked will prove the deliverance of the ſaints:—the need of unremitted vigilance:—the rulers conſult together about putting Jeſus to death:—Judas ſells him to them:—Jeſus eats the paſſover with his diſciples;—inſtitutes the commemoration of his death;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them;—aſſures them that, in his reign, humility and uſefulneſs will prove the only genuine honour;—foretells the tranſgreſſion of Peter,—and ſome of the calamities to which they were ſoon to be expoſed:—the agony on Mount Olivet:—he is ſeized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas;—heals the high prieſt's ſervant whoſe ear had been cut off by one of the Apoſtles. 435

SECTION XIV.

The CRUCIFIXION.

CH. XXII. 54, &c. XXIII. 1—49.

Jeſus is brought to the high prieſt's houſe;—denied by Peter;—abuſed by the ſervants;—tried by the Sanhedrim, and condemned;—conſigned to the Roman procurator, before whom they accuſe him of ſedition and rebellion:—Pilate not convinced, ſends him to Herod then at Jeruſalem:—Herod diſappointed of ſeeing him perform miracles, derides him, and remands him to Pilate:—Pilate perceiving his innocence, tries in vain to ſave him, on pretence of granting him to the prayer of the people, accuſtomed to obtain the releaſe of a priſoner at the paſſover;—but they and their rulers obſtinately demand the crucifixion of Jeſus, and the releaſe of Barabbas impriſoned for ſedition and murder:—Pilate reluctantly conſents to gratify them:—Jeſus led to Calvary, the croſs carried by Simon a Cyrenian;—is followed by ſome female diſciples, who lament him;—is nailed to the croſs between two malefactors;—prays for his enemies;—is inſulted by all ranks;—one of the malefactors joins in inſulting him;—and is rebuked by his companion:—Jeſus promiſes paradiſe to the penitent criminal:—the death of Jeſus attended with ſuch prodigies as confound the centurion and other ſpectators. 435

SECTION XV.

The RESURRECTION.

CH. XXIII. 50, &c. XXIV.

The body of Jeſus given to Joſeph of Arimathea, who depoſits it in his own ſepulchre:—the reſurrection of Jeſus announced by angels to ſome pious women at the ſepulchre;—theſe report it to the diſciples:—Peter haſtens to the ſepulchre, where he finds nothing but the linen:—Jeſus appears to two diſciples on the way to Emmaus;—he appears to Peter and afterwards to the eleven:—he eats with them, and ſhows them from the Scriptures, the neceſſity of his death and reſurrection;—commiſſions them to preach his doctrine, after the inſtructions they were ſoon to receive from the Holy Spirit;—leads them out to Bethany,—and having bleſſed them, aſcends into heaven. 437

THE

GOSPEL

BY

LUKE.

Introduction.

I. FORASMUCH as many have undertaken to compoſe a narrative
2 of thoſe things which have been accompliſhed amongſt us, as they
who were from the beginning eye witneſſes, and afterwards miniſters of
3 the word, delivered them to us; I have alſo determined, having exactly
traced every thing from the firſt, to write a particular account to thee,
4 moſt excellent Theophilus; that thou mayeſt know the certainty of thoſe
matters wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.

SECTION I.

The Annunciation.

5 IN the days of Herod, king of Judea, there was a prieſt named Za-
charias, of the courſe of Abijah; and his wife, named Elizabeth, 1 Chron. 24. 10.
6 was of the daughters of Aaron. They were both righteous before God,
blameleſs obſervers of all the Lord's commandments and ordinances.
7 And they had no child, becauſe Elizabeth was barren, and they were
both advanced in years.
8 Now when he came to officiate as prieſt in the order of his courſe, it
9 fell to him by lot, according to the cuſtom of the prieſthood, to offer incenſe Ex. 30. 7.
Lev. 16. 12.
in

10 *in the ſanctuary.* And *while the incenſe was burning, the whole con-*
11 *gregation were praying without. Then there appeared to him a meſſen-*
12 *ger of the Lord, ſtanding on the right ſide of the altar of incenſe. And*
13 *Zacharias was diſcompoſed at the ſight, and in great terror. But the*
angel ſaid to him, Fear not Zacharias; for thy prayer is heard, and
Elizabeth thy wife ſhall bear thee a ſon, whom thou ſhalt name
14 John (*a*). He ſhall be to thee matter of joy and tranſport; and ma-
15 ny ſhall rejoice becauſe of his birth. For he ſhall be great before the
Lord; he ſhall not drink wine, nor any fermented liquor; but he
ſhall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb.
16 And many of the ſons of Iſrael he ſhall bring back to the Lord their
Mal. 4; 6. 17 God. Moreover, he ſhall go before him in the ſpirit and power of
Mat. 11; 14. Elijah, to reconcile fathers to their children, and, by the wiſdom of
the righteous, to render the diſobedient a people well diſpoſed for
18 the Lord. *And Zacharias ſaid to the angel,* Whereby ſhall I know
19 this; for I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years? *The*
angel anſwering, ſaid unto him, I am Gabriel (*b*), who attend in the
20 preſence of God, and am ſent to tell thee this joyful news. But
know that thou ſhalt be dumb, and ſhalt not recover thy ſpeech,
until the day when theſe things happen; becauſe thou haſt not be-
lieved my words, which ſhall be fulfilled in due time.
21 *Meantime the people waited for Zacharias, and wondered that he ſtaid*
22 *ſo long in the ſanctuary. But when he came out, he could not ſpeak to*
them; and they perceived that he had ſeen a viſion in the ſanctuary; for
23 *he made them underſtand him by ſigns, and remained ſpeechleſs. And*
24 *when his days of officiating were expired, he returned home. Soon after,*
Elizabeth his wife conceived, and lived in retirement five months, and
25 *ſaid,* The Lord hath done this for me, purpoſing now to deliver me
from the reproach I lay under among men.

26 *NOW in the ſixth month God ſent Gabriel his meſſenger to Nazareth,*
27 *a city of Galilee; to a virgin betrothed to a man called Joſeph, of the*
28 *houſe of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. When the angel*
entered, he ſaid to her, Hail, favourite of heaven! the Lord be with
29 thee, thou happieſt of women! *At his appearance and words ſhe was*
perplexed, and revolved in her mind what this ſalutation could mean.
30 *And the angel ſaid to her,* Fear not Mary, for thou haſt found fa-
Iſ. 7; 14. 31 vour with God. And behold, thou ſhalt conceive and bear a ſon,
Mat. 1; 21. 32 whom thou ſhalt name Jeſus (*c*). He ſhall be great, and ſhall be
ch. 2; 21. called the Son of the Higheſt. And the Lord God will give him the
Dan. 7; 14. 33 throne of David his father. And he ſhall reign over the houſe of
Jacob

(*a*) The Lord's favour. (*b*) God's power. (*c*) Saviour.

34 Jacob for ever: his reign ſhall never end. *Then ſaid Mary to the*
angel, How ſhall this be, ſince I have no intercourſe with man?
35 *The angel anſwering, ſaid unto her*, The Holy Spirit will deſcend
upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt will overſhadow thee;
36 therefore the holy progeny ſhall be called the Son of God. And lo,
thy couſin Elizabeth alſo hath conceived a ſon in her old age; and
37 ſhe who is called barren, is now in her ſixth month: for nothing is
38 impoſſible with God. *And Mary ſaid*, Behold the handmaid of
the Lord. Be it unto me according to thy word. *Then the angel*
departed.

39 *In thoſe days Mary ſet out and travelled expeditiouſly into the hill-*
40 *country, to a city of Judah; where having entered the houſe of Zacha-*
41 *rias, ſhe ſaluted Elizabeth. As ſoon as Elizabeth heard Mary's ſalu-*
tation, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the
42 *Holy Spirit, and cried with a loud voice*, Thou art the moſt bleſſed of
43 women, and bleſſed is the fruit of thy womb. But how have I de-
44 ſerved this honour, to be viſited by the mother of my Lord: for
know, that as ſoon as the ſound of thy ſalutation reached mine ears,
45 the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And happy is ſhe who be-
lieved, that the things which the Lord hath promiſed her, ſhall be
performed.

46 *Then Mary ſaid*, My ſoul magnifieth the Lord, and my ſpirit re-
48 joiceth in God my Saviour: becauſe he hath not diſdained the low
condition of his handmaid, for henceforth all poſterity will pronounce
49 me happy. For the Almighty, whoſe name is venerable, hath done
50 wonders for me. His mercy on them who fear him, extendeth to
51 generations of generations. He diſplayeth the ſtrength of his arm,
52 and diſpelleth the vain imaginations of the proud. He pulleth down Pſ. 33; 10.
53 potentates from their thrones, and exalteth the lowly. The needy 1 Sam. 2; 6.
54 he loadeth with benefits; but the rich he ſpoileth of every thing. He Pſ. 34; 10.
55 ſupporteth Iſrael his ſervant (as he promiſed to our fathers), ever in- Iſ. 41; 8.
56 clined to mercy towards Abraham and his race. *And Mary, after* Gen. 17; 19. 22; 18.
ſtaying with Elizabeth about three months, returned home.

SECTION II.

The Nativity.

57 *WHEN the time for Elizabeth's delivery was come, ſhe brought*
58 *forth a ſon: and her neighbours and relations who heard that the*
59 *Lord had ſhown her great kindneſs, congratulated with her. And on*
the eighth day, when they came to the child's circumciſion, they would
60 *have him called by his father's name, Zacharias. And his mother, in-*
61 *terpoſed, ſaying,* No; but he ſhall be called John. *They ſaid unto*
62 *her,* There is none of thy kindred of that name. *They therefore*
63 *aſked his father by ſigns, how he would have him called. He having*
demanded a table-book, wrote thereon, " *His name is John,*" *which*
64 *ſurpriſed them all. And his mouth was opened directly, and his tongue*
65 *looſed. And he ſpake, praiſing* God. *Now all in the neighbourhood*
were ſtruck with awe; and the fame of theſe things ſpread throughout
66 *all the hill-country of Judea. And all who heard theſe things, ponder-*
ing them in their hearts, ſaid, What will this child prove hereafter?
And the hand of the Lord was with him.

67 *Then Zacharias his father, being filled with the Holy Spirit, pro-*
68 *phecied, ſaying,* Bleſſed be the Lord the God of Iſrael, becauſe he
70 hath viſited and redeemed his people; and (as anciently he promiſed
Pſ. 132; 17. by his holy Prophets) hath raiſed a prince for our deliverance in the
Jer. 23; 6. 71 houſe of David his ſervant; for our deliverance from our enemies,
& 30; 10. 72 and from the hands of all who hate us; in kindneſs to our forefathers,
Gen. 22; 16. 73 and remembrance of his holy covenant; the oath which he ſwore to
Jer. 31; 33. 74 our father Abraham, to grant unto us, that being reſcued out of the
75 hands of our enemies, we might ſerve him boldly, in piety and ſtrict
ch 1; 17. 76 juſtice, all the days of our life. And thou child ſhalt be called a Pro-
phet of the Moſt High; for thou ſhalt go before the Lord, to prepare
77 his way, by giving the knowledge of ſalvation to his people, in the
Mal. 4; 2. 78 remiſſion of their ſins, through the tender compaſſion of our God,
79 who hath cauſed a light to ſpring from on high to viſit us, to en-
lighten thoſe who abide in darkneſs and in the ſhades of death, to
direct our feet into the way of peace.

80 *Now the child grew, and acquired ſtrength of mind, and continued*
in the deſerts, until the time when he made himſelf known to Iſrael.

II. *ABOUT that time Ceſar Auguſtus iſſued an edict that all the inha-*
2 *bitants of the empire ſhould be regiſtered. (This firſt regiſter took effect*

3 *when Cyrenius (d) was preſident of Syria). When all went to be regiſ-*
4 *tered, every one to his own city, Joſeph alſo went from Nazareth, a* Mat. 2; 4.
city of Galilee, to the city of David in Judea called Bethlehem (for he Jo. 7; 42.
5 *was of the houſe and lineage of David), to be regiſtered, with Mary*
6 *his betrothed wife, who was pregnant. While they were there, the*
7 *time came that ſhe ſhould be delivered. And ſhe brought forth her firſt-*
born ſon, and ſwathed him, and laid him in a manger, becauſe there
was no room for them in the houſe allotted to ſtrangers.
8 *Now there were ſhepherds in the fields in that country, who tended*
9 *their flock by turns through the night-watches. On a ſudden a meſſenger*
of the Lord ſtood by them, and a divine glory encompaſſed them with
10 *light, and they were frightened exceedingly. But the angel ſaid to them,*
Fear not; for lo I bring you good tidings, which ſhall prove matter
11 of great joy to all the people; becauſe to-day is born unto you, in
12 the city of David, a Saviour, who is the Lord Meſſiah. And by
this ye ſhall know him; ye ſhall find a babe in ſwaddling bands, lying
13 in the manger. *Inſtantly the angel was attended by a multitude of the*
14 *heavenly hoſt, who praiſed God, ſaying,* Glory to God in the higheſt
heaven, and peace upon the earth, and good will towards men.
15 *And when the angels returned to heaven, having left the ſhepherds,*
theſe ſaid one to another, Let us go to Bethlehem, and ſee this which
16 hath happened, whereof the Lord hath informed us. *And haſtening*
thither, they found Mary and Joſeph with the babe who lay in the
17 *manger. When they ſaw this, they publiſhed what had been imparted to*
18 *them concerning this child. And all who heard it, wondered at the*
19 *things told them by the ſhepherds. But Mary let none of theſe things*
20 *eſcape unobſerved, weighing every circumſtance within herſelf. And*
the ſhepherds returned, glorifying and praiſing God for all that they had
heard and ſeen, agreeably to what had been declared unto them.

21 *ON the eighth day, when the child was circumciſed, they called him* Gen. 17; 12.
Jeſus, the angel having given him that name before his mother con- ch. 1; 31.
ceived him.

22 *AND when the time of their purification was expired, they carried* Lev. 12; 2.
him to Jeruſalem, as the law of Moſes appointeth, to preſent him to the
23 *Lord (as it is written in the law of God, "Every male, who is the* Ex. 13; 2.
24 *"firſt-born of his mother, is conſecrated to the Lord"); and to offer* Num. 8; 17.
the ſacrifice enjoined in the law, a pair of turtle-doves, or two young
pigeons.
25 *Now there was at Jeruſalem a man named Simeon, a juſt and a reli-*
gious man, who expected the conſolation of Iſrael; and the Holy Spirit

(d) In Latin authors *Quirinius*.

26 was upon him, and had revealed unto him, that he ſhould not die until
27 he had ſeen the Lord's Meſſiah. This man came, guided by the Spirit,
into the temple. And when the parents brought in the child Jeſus, to
28 do for him what the law required, he took him into his arms, and bleſ-
29 ſed God, and ſaid, Now, Lord, thou doſt in peace diſmiſs thy ſer-
30 vant, according to thy word; for mine eyes have ſeen the Saviour,
31 whom thou haſt provided in the ſight of all the world; a luminary
33 to enlighten the nations, and be the glory of Iſrael thy people. And
Joſeph, and the mother of Jeſus, heard with admiration the things
34 ſpoken concerning him. And Simon bleſſed them, and ſaid to Mary his
Iſ. 8; 14. Ro. 9; 32. 1 Pet. 2; 7. mother, This child is deſtined for the fall and the riſe of many in
35 Iſrael, and to ſerve as a mark for contradiction (yea, thine own ſoul
ſhall be pierced as with a javelin); that the thoughts of many hearts
may be diſcloſed.
36 There was alſo a propheteſs, Anna, daughter of Phanuel, of the
tribe of Aſher, in an advanced age, who had lived ſeven years with a
37 huſband, whom ſhe married when a virgin; and being now a widow of
about eighty-four years, departed not from the temple, but ſerved God
38 in prayer and faſting night and day; ſhe alſo coming in at that inſtant,
gave thanks to the Lord, and ſpake concerning Jeſus to all thoſe in Je-
ruſalem who expected deliverance.
39 After they had performed every thing required by the law of the Lord,
40 they returned to Galilee, to their own city Nazareth. And the child
grew and acquired ſtrength of mind, being filled with wiſdom, and
adorned with a divine gracefulneſs.

SECTION III.

The Baptiſm.

41 NOW his parents went yearly to Jeruſalem at the feaſt of the paſſ-
Ex. 23; 14. Deut. 16; 1. 42 over. And when he was twelve years old, they having gone thi-
43 ther, according to the uſage of the feſtival, and remained the cuſtomary
time; being on their return, the child Jeſus ſtaid behind in Jeruſalem,
44 and neither Joſeph nor his mother knew it. They ſuppoſing him to be
in the company, went a day's journey, and then ſought him among their
45 relations and acquaintance; but not finding him, they returned to Jeru-
46 ſalem, ſeeking him. And after three days, they found him in the tem-
ple, ſitting among the doctors, both hearing them, and aſking them queſ-
47 tions. And all who heard him were aſtoniſhed; but they who ſaw him
were amazed at his underſtanding and anſwers. And his mother ſaid
to him, Son, why haſt thou treated us thus? Behold, thy father and
49 I have ſought thee with ſorrow. He anſwered, Why did ye ſeek
me?

50 me? Knew ye not that I must be at my father's? *But they did not*
comprehend his answer.
51 *And he returned with them to Nazareth, and was subject unto them.*
52 *And his mother treasured up all these things in her memory. And*
Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in power with God and
man.

III. *NOW in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, Pontius Pilate*
being procurator of Judea, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, Philip his bro-
ther tetrarch of Iturea, and the province of Trachonitis, and Lysanias
2 *tetrarch of Abilene, in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the* Acts, 4; 6.
3 *word of God came in the wilderness to John the son of Zacharias. And* Mat. 3; 1. Mar. 1; 2.
he went through all the country along the Jordan, publishing the baptism Is. 40; 3.
4 *of reformation for the remission of sins. As it is written in the book of* Jo. 1; 23.
the prophet Isaiah, "The voice of one proclaiming in the wilderness,
5 *"prepare a way for the Lord (e), make for him a straight passage. Let*
"every valley be filled, every mountain and hill be levelled; let the
6 *"crooked roads be made straight, and the rough ways smooth, that all*
7 *"flesh may see the Saviour [sent] of God." Then said he to the multi-* Mat. 3; 7.
tudes who flocked out to be baptized by him, Offspring of vipers, who
8 hath prompted you to flee from the impending vengeance? Produce
then the proper fruits of reformation; and begin not to say within
yourselves, 'We have Abraham for our father;' for I assure you,
9 that of these stones God can raise children to Abraham. And even
now the ax lieth at the root of the trees. Every tree, therefore,
which produceth not good fruit, is felled and thrown into the fire.
10. *Upon this the multitude asked him,* What must we do then? *He an-* 1 Jo. 3; 17.
swered, Let him who hath two coats impart to him who hath none; Ja. 2; 15.
12 and let him who hath victuals do the same. *There came also publi-*
13 *cans to be baptized, who said,* Rabbi, what must we do? *He answer-*
14 *ed,* Exact no more than what is appointed you. *Soldiers likewise*
asked him, And what must we do? *He answered,* Injure no man,
either by violence, or by false accusation, and be content with your
allowance.
15 *As the people were in suspense concerning John, every man imagining*
16 *within himself that he might be the Messiah, John addressed them all,*
saying, I indeed baptize you in water; but one mightier than I Mat. 3; 11. Mar. 1; 7.
cometh, whose shoe-latchet I am not worthy to untie; he will Jo. 1; 26.
17 baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire: his winnowing shovel is Acts, 1; 5.
in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his grain; he will & 11; 16.
gather the wheat into his granary, and consume the chaff in un- & 19; 4.
quenchable

(e) Jehovah.

18 quenchable fire. *And with many other exhortations he publiſhed the good tidings to the people.*

Mat. 14; 3. Mar. 6; 17. 19 *BUT Herod the tetrarch having been reproved by him, on account*
of Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the crimes which Herod
20 *had committed, added this to the number, that he confined John in priſon.*

Mat. 3; 13. Mar. 1; 9. Jo. 1; 32. Mat. 17; 5. ch. 9; 35. 2 Pet. 1; 17. 21 *NOW when John baptized all the people, Jeſus was likewiſe bap-*
22 *tized; and while he prayed, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spi-*
rit deſcended upon him in a bodily form, like a dove, and a voice came
from heaven, which ſaid, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I delight.
Mat. 1; 1. 23 *Now Jeſus was himſelf about thirty years in ſubjection, being (as was*
24 *ſuppoſed) a ſon of Joſeph, ſon of Heli, ſon of Matthat, ſon of Levi, ſon*
25 *of Melchi, ſon of Janna, ſon of Joſeph, ſon of Mattathias, ſon of*
26 *Amos, ſon of Nahum, ſon of Eſli, ſon of Naggai, ſon of Maath, ſon*
27 *of Mattathias, ſon of Shimei, ſon of Joſeph, ſon of Judah, ſon of Jo-*
anna, ſon of Rheſa, ſon of Zerubbabel, ſon of Salathiel, ſon of Neri,
28 *ſon of Melchi, ſon of Addi, ſon of Coſam, ſon of Elmodam, ſon of Er,*
29 *ſon of Joſes, ſon of Eliezer, ſon of Jorim, ſon of Matthat, ſon of Levi,*
30 *ſon of Simeon, ſon of Judah, ſon of Joſeph, ſon of Jonan, ſon of Elia-*
31 *kim, ſon of Melcah, ſon of Mainan, ſon of Mattatha, ſon of Nathan,*
32 *ſon of David, ſon of Jeſſe, ſon of Obed, ſon of Boaz, ſon of Salmon,*
33 *ſon of Nahſhon, ſon of Amminadab, ſon of Ram, ſon of Hezron, ſon of*
34 *Pharez, ſon of Judah, ſon of Jacob, ſon of Iſaac, ſon of Abraham, ſon*
35 *of Terah, ſon of Nahor, ſon of Serug, ſon of Reu, ſon of Peleg, ſon*
36 *of Eber, ſon of Salah, ſon of Cainan, ſon of Arphaxad, ſon of Shem,*
37 *ſon of Noah, ſon of Lamech, ſon of Methuſelah, ſon of Enoch, ſon of*
38 *Jared, ſon of Mehalaliel, ſon of Cainan, ſon of Enos, ſon of Seth, ſon*
of Adam, ſon of God.

Mat. 4; 1. Mar. 1; 12. IV. *NOW Jeſus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and*
2 *was led by the Spirit into the wilderneſs, where he continued forty days,*
and was tempted by the devil. Having eaten nothing all that time,
3 *when it was ended, he was hungry. And the devil ſaid to him,* If
Deut. 8; 3. 4 thou be a Son of God, command this ſtone to become bread. *Jeſus*
anſwered him, ſaying, It is written, "Man liveth not by bread only,
5 "but by whatever God pleaſeth." *Then the devil having brought*
him to the top of a high mountain, ſhowed him all the kingdoms of the
6 *earth in an inſtant, and ſaid to him,* All this power and glory I will
give thee; for it is delivered to me, and to whomſoever I will I give
7 it; if, therefore, thou wilt worſhip me, it ſhall all be thine. *Jeſus*

answering, said, It is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord (*f*) Deut. 6; 13.
9 thy God, and shalt serve him only." *Then he brought him to Jeru-* 10; 20.
salem, and placing him on the battlement of the temple, said to him, If 1 Sam. 7; 3.
10 thou be a Son of God, throw thyself down hence; for it is written, Ps. 91; 11.
11 "He will give his angels charge concerning thee to keep thee; and
"in their arms they shall uphold thee, lest thou dash thy foot against
12 "a stone." *Jesus answered*, It is said, "Thou shalt not make trial Deut. 6; 16.
13 "of the Lord (*g*) thy God." *When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a time.*

SECTION IV.

The Entrance on the Ministry.

14 *THEN Jesus, by the impulse of the Spirit, returned to Galilee, and* Mat. 4; 12.
15 *his renown spread throughout the whole country, and he taught in* Mar. 1; 14.
their synagogues with universal applause.
16 *Being come to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, he entered* Mat. 13; 54.
the synagogue, as his custom was, on the Sabbath day, and stood up to Mar. 6; 1.
17 *read. And they put into his hands the book of the Prophet Isaiah, and* Jo. 4; 45.
18 *having opened the book, he found the place where it was written, "The* Is. 61; 1.
"*Spirit of the Lord (h) is upon me, inasmuch as he hath anointed me*
"*to publish glad tidings to the poor; he hath commissioned me to heal*
"*the broken-hearted, to announce liberty to the captives, and recovery*
19 "*of sight to the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of*
20 "*acceptance with the Lord (i).*" *And having closed the book, and returned it to the servant, he sat down. And the eyes of all in the syna-*
21 *gogue were fixed upon him. And he began with saying to them*, This very day the Scripture which ye have just now heard is fulfilled.
22 *And all expressed their admiration of him; and being astonished at the words, full of grace, which he uttered, they said*, Is not this Joseph's
23 son? *He said unto them*, Ye will doubtless apply to me this proverb, 'Physician, cure thyself.' Do as great things here in thine own
24 country, as we hear thou hast done in Capernaum. But in fact, *added he*, no Prophet was ever well received in his own country.
25 I tell you of a truth, there were many widows in Israel in the days 1 Ki. 17; 1.
of Elijah, when heaven was shut up for three years and a half, so
26 that there was a great famine throughout all the land: yet to none of them was Elijah sent, but to a widow in Sarepta (*k*) of Sidonia.
27 There were likewise many lepers in Israel in the days of Elisha the Prophet:

(*f*) Jehovah. (*g*) Jehovah. (*h*) Jehovah.
(*i*) Jehovah. (*k*) In the Old Testament *Zarephath*.

2 Ki. 5; 14. Prophet: and Naaman the Syrian was cleanſed, but none of thoſe.
28 *On hearing this, the whole ſynagogue were enraged, and breaking up,*
drove him out of the city, and brought him to the brow of the mountain
whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong.
30 *But he paſſing through the midſt of them, went away.*
31 *Then he came to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on*
Mat. 7; 28. 32 *the Sabbath. And they were aſtoniſhed at his manner of teaching; for*
Mar. 1; 22. *he ſpoke with authority.*
Mar. 1; 23. 33 *Now there was in the ſynagogue a man poſſeſſed by the ſpirit of an*
34 *unclean demon, who roared out, ſaying,* Ah! Jeſus of Nazareth, what
haſt thou to do with us? Art thou come to deſtroy us? I know who
35 thou art, the holy one of God. *And Jeſus rebuked him, ſaying,* Be
ſilent, and come out of him. *Whereupon the demon, having thrown*
him down in the middle of the aſſembly, came out without harming him.
36 *And they were all in amazement, and ſaid one to another,* What mean-
eth this, that with authority and power he commandeth the unclean
37 ſpirits, and they come out. *Thenceforth his fame was blazed in every*
corner of the country.
Mat. 8; 14. 38 *When he was gone out of the ſynagogue, he entered the houſe of Si-*
Mar. 1; 29. *mon, whoſe wife's mother had a violent fever, and they entreated him on*
39 *her behalf. Jeſus ſtanding near her, rebuked the fever, and it left*
her, and ſhe inſtantly aroſe and ſerved them.
40 *After ſunſet, all they who had any ſick, of whatever kind of diſeaſe,*
brought them to him; and he, laying his hands on every one, cured
Mar. 1; 34. 41 *them. Demons alſo came out of many, crying out,* Thou art the Meſ-
ſiah, the Son of God. *But he rebuked them, and would not allow*
42 *them to ſpeak, becauſe they knew that he was the Meſſiah. When it*
was day, he retired into a deſert place; and the multitude ſought him
43 *out, and came to him, and urged him not to leave them; but he ſaid to*
them, I muſt publiſh the good tidings of the reign of God in other
44 cities alſo, becauſe for this purpoſe I am ſent. *Accordingly he made*
this publication in the ſynagogues of Galilee.

V. *ONE time, as he ſtood by the lake of Gennezareth (l), the multitude*
2 *preſſing upon him to hear the word of God, he ſaw two barks aground*
near the edge, but the fiſhermen were on ſhore waſhing their nets.
3 *Having gone aboard one of them, which was Simon's, he deſired him to*
put off a little from the land. Then he ſat down, and taught the people
out of the bark.
4 *When he had done ſpeaking, he ſaid to Simon,* Launch out into deep
5 water, and let down your nets for a draught. *Simon anſwered,*
Maſter, we have toiled all night, and have caught nothing; never-
theleſs,

(*l*) In the Old Teſtament *Chinnereth.*

6 thelefs, at thy word, I will let down the net. *Having done this,*
they enclofed fuch a multitude of fifhes, that the net began to break.
7 *And they beckoned to their companions in the other bark to come and help*
them. And they came and laded both the barks, fo that they were near
8 *finking. When Simon Peter faw this, he threw himfelf at Jefus' knees,*
9 *crying,* Depart from me, Lord, for I am a finful man. *For the*
draught of fifhes which they had taken had filled him and all his compa-
10 *nions with terror, particularly James and John, fons of Zebedee, who*
were Simon's partners. And Jefus faid to Simon, Fear not, hence-
11 forth thou fhalt catch men. *And having brought their barks to land,*
they forfook all and followed him.

12 *When he was in one of the neighbouring cities, a man covered with* Mat. 8; 2.
leprofy, happening to fee him, threw himfelf on his face, and befought Mar. 1; 40.
13 *him, faying,* Maſter, if thou wilt, thou canſt cleanſe me. *Jefus*
ſtretching out his hand, and touching him, ſaid, I will; be thou
14 cleanſed. *That inſtant his leprofy departed from him. And he com-*
manded him to tell nobody. But go [*ſaid he*], ſhow thyſelf to the
prieſt, and preſent the offering appointed by Moſes, for notifying to Lev. 14; 3
15 the people that thou art cleanſed. *Yet ſo much the more was Jefus*
every where talked of, that vaſt multitudes flocked to hear him, and to
16 *be cured by him of their maladies. And he withdrew into ſolitary places,*
and prayed.

17 *ONE day, as he was teaching, and phariſees and doctors of law*
were ſitting by, who had come from Jeruſalem, and from every town of
Galilee and Judea, the power of the Lord was exerted in the cure of
18 *the ſick. And behold ſome men carrying on a bed a man afflicted with a* Mat. 9; 2
19 *palſy, endeavoured to bring him in, and place him before Jefus; but* Mar. 2; 3
finding it impracticable, by reaſon of the crowd, they gat upon the roof,
and let him down through the tiling, with the little bed in the midſt be-
20 *fore him. Jefus perceiving their faith, ſaid to him,* Man, thy ſins ch. 7; 48.
21 are forgiven thee. *On which the ſcribes and the phariſees reaſoned thus,*
'Who is this that ſpeaketh blaſphemies? Can any one forgive ſins beſide
22 *God?' Jefus knowing their thoughts, addreſſed himſelf to them, and*
23 *ſaid,* What are ye reaſoning in your hearts? Whether is eaſier, to
ſay, 'Thy ſins are forgiven thee;' or to ſay [with effect] 'Ariſe
24 'and walk?' But, that ye may know that the Son of Man hath
power upon the earth to forgive ſins, Ariſe *(ſaid he to the palſied*
25 *man)*, take up thy bed, and return to thy houſe. *That inſtant he*
roſe in their preſence, took up his bed, and returned home, glorifying
26 *God. Seeing this, they were all ſtruck with amazement and reverence,*
and glorified God, ſaying, We have ſeen incredible things to-day.

27 *After this he went out, and obſerving a publican named Levi ſitting* Mat. 9; 9.
28 *at the toll-office, ſaid to him,* Follow me. *And he aroſe, left all, and* Mar. 2; 14.
followed

29 *followed him. And Levi made him a great entertainment in his own*
houſe, where there was a great company of publicans and others at table
30 *with them. But the ſcribes and the phariſees of the place murmured,*
ſaying to his diſciples, Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and
31 ſinners? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them*, It is not the healthy, but
32 the ſick, who need a phyſician. I am come to call, not the righteous, but ſinners, to reformation.

Mat. 9; 14. Mar. 2; 18. 33 *Then they aſked him*, How is it that the diſciples of John, and likewiſe thoſe of the phariſees, frequently faſt and pray, but thine
34 eat and drink? *He anſwered*, Would ye have the bridemen faſt, while
35 the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come wherein the bridegroom ſhall be taken from them: in thoſe days they will faſt.
36 *He added this ſimilitude*, Nobody mendeth an old mantle with new cloth; otherwiſe the new will rend the old; beſides, the old and the
37 new will never ſuit each other. Nobody putteth new wine into old leathern bottles; otherwiſe the new wine will burſt the bottles, and
38 thus the wine will be ſpilled, and the bottles rendered uſeleſs. But
39 if new wine be put into new bottles, both will be preſerved. Beſides, a man, after drinking old wine, calleth not immediately for new; for he ſaith, 'The old is milder.'

Mat. 12; 1. Mar. 2; 23. VI. *ON the Sabbath called ſecondprime, as Jeſus was paſſing through*
the cornfields, his diſciples plucked the ears of corn, and rubbed them in
2 *their hands, and ate them. And ſome phariſees ſaid to them*, Why do
1 Sam. 21; 1. Lev. 24; 5. 3 ye that which it is not lawful, on the Sabbath to do? *Jeſus replying,*
ſaid to them, Did ye never read what David and his attendants did,
4 when they were hungry; how he entered the manſion of God, and took and ate the loaves of the preſence, and gave alſo of this bread to his attendants; though it cannot be eaten lawfully by any but the
5 prieſts? *He added*, The Son of Man is maſter even of the Sabbath.

Mat. 12; 9. Mar. 3; 1. 6 *It happened alſo, on another Sabbath, that he went into the ſyna-*
gogue, and taught; and a man was there, whoſe right hand was
7 *blaſted. Now the ſcribes and the phariſees watched to ſee whether he*
would heal on the Sabbath, that they might find matter for accuſing him.
8 *But he knowing their thoughts, ſaid to the man whoſe hand was blaſted,*
9 Ariſe, and ſtand in the middle. *And he aroſe and ſtood. Then Jeſus*
ſaid to them, I would aſk you, What is it lawful to do on the Sab-
10 bath? Good or ill? To ſave or to deſtroy? *And looking around on*
them all, he ſaid to the man, Stretch out thy hand; *and in doing this,*
11 *his hand was rendered ſound like the other. But they were filled with*
madneſs, and communed together what they ſhould do to Jeſus.

SECTION V.

The Nomination of Apoſtles.

12 *IN thoſe days he retired to a mountain to pray, and ſpent the whole*
13 *night in an oratory. When it was day, he called to him his diſciples;* Mat. 10; 2.
14 *and of them he choſe twelve, whom he named Apoſtles. Simon, whom* Mar. 3; 13.
he alſo named Peter, and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip
15 *and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James ſon of Alpheus, and*
16 *Simon called the Zealous, Judas brother of James, and Judas Iſcariot,* Jude, 1.
who proved a traitor.
17 *Afterwards, coming down with them, he ſtopped in a plain, whither*
a company of his diſciples, with a vaſt multitude from all parts of Ju-
dea, Jeruſalem, and the maritime country of Tyre and Sidon, were
18 *come to hear him, and to be healed of their diſeaſes. Thoſe alſo who*
19 *were infeſted with unclean ſpirits, came and were cured. And every*
one ſtrove to touch him, becauſe a virtue came from him, which healed
them all.

20 *THEN lifting his eyes on his diſciples, he ſaid,* Happy ye poor, Mat. 5; 3.
21 for the kingdom of God is yours! Happy ye that hunger now, for
ye ſhall be ſatisfied! Happy ye that weep now, for ye ſhall laugh!
22 Happy ſhall ye be when men ſhall hate you, and exclude you from Iſ. 61; 3.
their ſociety; yea, reproach and defame you, on account of the Son 1 Pet. 3; 14.
23 of Man! Rejoice on that day, and triumph, knowing that your re- and 4; 14.
ward in heaven is great! for thus did their fathers treat the Prophets.
24 But woe unto you rich; for ye have received your comforts! Woe Iſ. 65; 13.
unto you that are full; for ye ſhall hunger! Woe unto you who
26 laugh now; for ye ſhall mourn and weep! Woe unto you, when
men ſhall ſpeak well of you; for ſo did their fathers of the falſe
prophets.
27 But I charge you, my hearers, love your enemies, do good to Mat. 5; 44.
28 them who hate you, bleſs them who curſe you, and pray for them Ro. 12; 20.
29 who traduce you. To him who ſmiteth thee on one cheek, preſent
the other; and from him who taketh thy mantle, withhold not thy
30 coat. Give to every one who aſketh thee; and from him who Tob. 4; 16.
31 taketh away thy goods, do not demand them back. And as ye Mat. 7; 12.
would that men ſhould do unto you, do ye likewiſe unto them.
32 For if ye love thoſe [only] who love you, what thanks are ye enti-
33 tled to? ſince even ſinners love thoſe who love them. And if ye do
good to thoſe [only] who do good to you, what thanks are ye enti-
34 tled to? ſince even ſinners do the ſame. And if ye lend to thoſe

[only] from whom ye hope to receive, what thanks are ye entitled to? ſince even ſinners lend to ſinners, that they may receive as much
35 in return. But love ye your enemies, do good and lend, nowiſe deſpairing; and your reward ſhall be great; and ye ſhall be ſons of
36 the Moſt High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and malignant. Be therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful.

Mat. 7; 1. Ro. 2; 1. Mar. 4; 24.
37 Judge not, and ye ſhall not be judged; condemn not, and ye
38 ſhall not be condemned; releaſe, and ye ſhall be releaſed: give, and ye ſhall get: good meaſure, preſſed and ſhaken, and heaped, ſhall be poured into your lap; for with the ſame meaſure wherewith ye give to others, ye yourſelves ſhall receive.

Mat. 15; 14. Mat. 10; 24. Jo. 13; 16. Mat. 7; 3.
39 *He uſed alſo this compariſon:* Can the blind guide the blind? Will
40 not both fall into a ditch? The diſciple is not above his teacher; but
41 every finiſhed diſciple ſhall be as his teacher. And why obſerveſt thou the mote in thy brother's eye; but perceiveſt not the thorn in
42 thine own eye? Or how canſt thou ſay to thy brother, 'Brother, 'let me take out the mote which is in thine eye,' not conſidering that there is a thorn in thine own eye? Hypocrite, firſt take the thorn out of thine own eye; then thou wilt ſee to take out the mote

Mat. 7; 18. & 12; 33.
43 which is in thy brother's eye. That is not a good tree which yield-
44 eth bad fruit; nor is that a bad tree which yieldeth good fruit. For every tree is known by its own fruit. Figs are not gathered off
45 thorns; nor grapes off a bramble-buſh. The good man, out of the good treaſure of his heart, bringeth that which is good: the bad man, out of the bad treaſure of his heart, bringeth that which is bad; for it is out of the fullneſs of his heart that his mouth ſpeaketh.

Mat. 7; 21. Ro. 2; 13. Ja. 1; 22.
46 But why do ye, in addreſſing me, cry, Maſter, Maſter, and obey
47 not what I command? Whoever cometh to me, and heareth my precepts, and practiſeth them, I will ſhow you whom he reſembleth:
48 he reſembleth a man who built a houſe, and digging deep, laid the foundation upon the rock: and when an inundation came, the torrent broke upon that houſe, but could not ſhake it; for it was founded
49 upon the rock. But he who heareth, and doth not practiſe, reſembleth a man who, without laying a foundation, built a houſe upon the earth; againſt which, when the torrent brake, it fell, and became a great pile of ruins.

Mat. 8; 5.
VII. *WHEN he had finiſhed his diſcourſe in the audience of the people,*
2 *he entered Capernaum. And a centurion's ſervant, who was dear to*
3 *his maſter, was ſick, and in danger of dying. And the centurion having heard concerning Jeſus, ſent to him Jewiſh elders, to entreat him to*
4 *come and ſave his ſervant. When they came to Jeſus, they earneſtly*
5 *beſought him, ſaying,* He is worthy of this favour; for he loveth our
6 nation; and it was he who built our ſynagogue. *Then Jeſus went with*

them; and when he was not far from the houſe, the centurion ſent friends to him to ſay, Maſter, trouble not thyſelf; for I have not deſerved
7 that thou ſhouldſt come under my roof; wherefore neither thought I myſelf fit to come into thy preſence: ſay but the word, and my
8 ſervant will be healed. For even I, who am under the authority of others, having ſoldiers under me, ſay to one, 'Go,' and he goeth, to another, 'Come,' and he cometh, and to my ſervant, 'Do this,'
9 and he doth it. *Jeſus hearing theſe things, admired him, and turning, ſaid to the multitude which followed*, I aſſure you I have not found ſo
10 great faith, even in Iſrael. *And they who had been ſent having returned to the houſe, found the ſervant well who had been ſick.*

11 *The day following, he went into a city called Nain, accompanied by*
12 *his diſciples and a great crowd. As he approached the gate of the city, the people were carrying out a dead man, the only ſon of his mother,*
13 *who was a widow; and many of the citizens were with her. When the Lord ſaw her, he had pity upon her, and ſaid to her*, Weep not.
14 *Then he advanced, and touched the bier (the bearers ſtopping), and*
15 *ſaid*, Young man, ariſe, I command thee. *Then he who had been dead, ſat up, and began to ſpeak, and Jeſus delivered him to his mother.*
16 *And all preſent were ſtruck with awe, and glorified God, ſaying*, A great Prophet hath ariſen amongſt us; *and*, God hath viſited his peo-
17 ple. *And this report concerning him ſpread throughout Judea and all the neighbouring country.* ch. 24; 19.

18 *NOW John's diſciples having informed their maſter of all theſe*
19 *things, he called two of them, whom he ſent to Jeſus to aſk him, Art*
20 *thou he who cometh? or muſt we expect another? Being come to him, they ſaid*, John the Baptiſt hath ſent us to aſk thee, Art thou he who
21 cometh? or muſt we expect another? *At that very time Jeſus was delivering many from diſeaſes and maladies, and evil ſpirits, and giving*
22 *ſight to many who were blind. And he returned this anſwer*, Go, and report to John what ye have ſeen and heard: the blind are made to ſee, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear; the leprous are cleanſed, the dead are raiſed, glad tidings is brought to the poor. And happy
23 is he to whom I ſhall not prove a ſtumbling-block. Mat. 11; 2. If. 35; 5. If. 61; 1.

24 *When John's meſſengers were departed, Jeſus ſaid to the multitude concerning John*, What went you into the wilderneſs to behold? a
25 reed ſhaken by the wind? But what went ye out to ſee? a man effeminately dreſſed? It is in royal palaces [not in deſerts] that they
26 who wear ſplendid apparel, and live in luxury, are found. What then did ye go to ſee? a prophet? yea, I tell you, and ſomething
27 ſuperior to a prophet, For this is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold I ſend mine angel before thee, who ſhall prepare thy way." Mat. 11; 16. Mal. 3; 1. Mar. 1; 2.
28 For I declare unto you, among thoſe who are born of women, there

there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptiſt; yet the leaſt in
29 the reign of God ſhall be greater than he. All the people, even the publicans, who heard John, have, by receiving baptiſm from him,
30 glorified God; whereas the phariſees and the lawyers, in not being baptiſed by him, have rejected the counſel of God with regard to themſelves.

Mat. 11; 16. 31 Whereunto then ſhall I compare the men of this generation?
32 whom are they like? They are like children in the market-place, of whom their companions complain and ſay, 'We have played to you 'upon the pipe, but ye have not danced; we have ſung mournful
Mat. 3; 4. Mar. 1; 6. 33 'ſongs to you, but ye have not wept.' For John the Baptiſt is come abſtaining from bread and from wine, and ye ſay, 'He hath
34 'a demon.' The Son of Man is come uſing both, and ye ſay 'He 'is a lover of banquets and wine, an aſſociate of publicans and ſin-
35 'ners.' But wiſdom is juſtified by all her children.

SECTION VI.

Signal Miracles and Inſtructions.

36 *NOW one of the phariſees aſked Jeſus to eat with him: and he went*
Jo. 11; 2. & 12; 3. 37 *into the phariſee's houſe, and placed himſelf at table. And behold a woman in the city who was a ſinner, knowing that he ate at the houſe*
38 *of the phariſee, brought an alabaſter box of balſam, and ſtanding behind at his feet weeping, bathed them with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kiſſed his feet, and anointed them with the bal-*
39 *ſam. The phariſee who had invited him, obſerving this, ſaid within himſelf, 'If this man were a prophet, he would have known who this 'woman is that toucheth him, and of what character; for ſhe is a ſin-*
40 *'ner.' Then Jeſus ſaid to him*, Simon, I have ſomething to ſay to
41 thee. *He anſwered*, Say it, Rabbi. A certain creditor had two
42 debtors, one owed five hundred denarii (*m*), the other fifty (*n*). But not having wherewith to pay, he freely forgave them both. Say
43 then, which of them will love him moſt? *Simon anſwered*, I ſuppoſe he to whom he forgave moſt. *Jeſus replied*, Thou haſt judged
44 rightly. *Then turning to the woman, he ſaid to Simon*, Thou ſeeſt this woman: when I came into thy houſe, thou gaveſt me no water for my feet, but ſhe hath waſhed my feet with tears, and wiped
45 them with the hairs of her head. Thou gaveſt me no kiſs; but ſhe,
46 ſince ſhe entered, hath not ceaſed kiſſing my feet. Thou didſt not anoint my head with oil, but ſhe hath anointed my feet with balſam. Wherefore,

(*m*) About 15l. 12s. ſterling. (*n*) About 1l. 11s. ſterling.

47 Wherefore, I tell thee, her ſins, which are many, are forgiven; therefore her love is great. But he to whom little is forgiven, hath
48 little love. *Then he ſaid to her*, Thy ſins are forgiven. *Thoſe who* Mat. 9; 2. Mar. 2; 5.
were at table with him ſaid within themſelves, 'Who is this that even ch. 5; 20.
50 *forgiveth ſins?*' *But he ſaid to the woman*, Thy faith hath ſaved thee; go in peace.

VIII. *AFTERWARDS he travelled through cities and villages, proclaiming the joyful tidings of the reign of God, being attended by*
2 *the twelve, and by certain women who had been delivered from evil ſpirits and diſtempers, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went ſeven* Mar. 16; 9.
3 *demons, Joanna wife of Chuza, Herod's ſteward, Suſanna and ſeveral who aſſiſted him with their property.*
4 *Now when a great multitude was aſſembled, and the people were* Mat. 13; 3.
5 *flocking to him out of the cities, he ſpake by a parable*, The ſower Mar. 4; 2.
went out to ſow his grain: and in ſowing, part fell by the way-
6 ſide, and was cruſhed under foot, or picked up by the birds; part fell upon a rock, and when it was ſprung up, withered away for
7 want of moiſture; part alſo fell among thorns, and the thorns
8 grew up with it and choked it; and part fell into good ſoil, and ſprang up and yielded encreaſe a hundred fold. *Having ſaid this, he cried*, Whoſo hath ears to hear, let him hear.
9 *And his diſciples aſked him, ſaying*, What meaneth this parable? Mat. 13; 10.
10 *He anſwered*, It is your privilege to know the ſecrets of the reign Mar. 4; 10. If. 6; 9.
of God, which to others are couched in parables, that, though they look, they may not perceive; though they hear, they may not underſtand.
11 Now this is the meaning of the parable. The ſeed is the word Mat. 13; 18.
12 of God. By the wayſide are meant thoſe hearers out of whoſe Mar. 4; 14.
hearts the devil coming taketh away the word, leſt they ſhould
13 believe and be ſaved. By the rock are meant thoſe who, when they hear, receive the word with joy, yet not having it rooted in them, are but temporary believers; for in the time of trial
14 they fall off. By the ground encumbered with thorns, are meant thoſe hearers who are entangled in the buſineſs, and purſuits, and pleaſures of life, which ſtifle the word, ſo that it bringeth no fruit
15 to maturity. But by the good ſoil are meant thoſe, who, having heard the word, retain it in a good and honeſt heart, and continue to bring forth fruit.
16 A lamp is never lighted to be covered with a veſſel, or put under Mat. 5; 15.
a bed, but to be ſet on a ſtand, that they who enter may ſee the Mar. 4; 21. Mat. 10; 26.
17 light. For there is no ſecret which ſhall not be diſcovered; nor Mat. 25; 29.
any thing concealed which ſhall not be known and become pub-
18 lic. Take heed, therefore, how ye hear; for to him who hath,

more ſhall be given; but from him who hath not, ſhall be taken even that which he ſeemeth to have.

Mat. 12; 46. 19 *Then his mother and brothers came to ſpeak with him, but could not*
Mar. 3; 31. 20 *get near becauſe of the crowd. And it was told him by ſome perſons,*
21 Thy mother and thy brothers are without deſiring to ſee thee. *But he anſwering, ſaid unto them,* My mother and my brothers are thoſe who hear the word of God, and obey it.

Mat. 8; 23. 22 *ONE day Jeſus having gone into a bark with his diſciples, ſaid*
Mar. 5; 35. 23 *to them,* Let us croſs the lake. *Accordingly they ſet ſail. But while they ſailed, he fell aſleep, and there blew ſuch a ſtorm upon the lake as filled the bark with water, and endangered their lives.*
24 *And they came to him, and awakened him, ſaying,* Maſter, maſter, we periſh. *Then he aroſe and rebuked the wind, and the raging*
25 *of the water: and they ceaſed, and there was a calm. And Jeſus ſaid to them,* Where is your faith? *But they ſaid one to another with fear and admiration,* Who is this that commandeth even the
26 winds and the water, and they obey him? *And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes which is oppoſite to Galilee.*

Mat. 9; 28. 27 *Being come aſhore, a man of the city met him who had been long*
Mar. 5; 1. *poſſeſſed by demons, and who wore no clothes, and had no habitation*
28 *but the ſepulchres. When he ſaw Jeſus, he roared out, and threw himſelf at his feet, crying,* What haſt thou to do with me, Jeſus, Son of the Moſt High God? I beſeech thee, do not torment me.
29 *(For he had ordered the unclean ſpirit to come out of the man; for it had frequently ſeized him, inſomuch, that when he was chained and fettered, he broke his bonds, and was driven by the fiend into the deſert.)*
30 *Then Jeſus aſked him, ſaying,* What is thy name? *He anſwered* Le-
31 gion, *becauſe many demons had entered into him. And they entreated*
32 *him that he would not command them to go into the abyſs, but, as there was a numerous herd of ſwine feeding on the mountain, that he would*
33 *permit them to enter into the ſwine. And he permitted them. Then the demons, having quitted the man, entered into the ſwine; and the herd*
34 *ruſhed down a precipice into the lake, and were drowned. The herdſmen ſeeing this, fled, and ſpread the news through the city and villages.*
35 *And the inhabitants flocked out to ſee what had happened. Being come to Jeſus, and finding the man, of whom the demons were diſpoſſeſſed, ſitting at the feet of Jeſus, clothed, and in his right mind, they were*
36 *afraid. But having been informed by the ſpectators, in what manner*
37 *the demoniac had been delivered, all the people of the country of the Gadarenes entreated him to leave them; for they were ſtruck with ter-*
38 *ror. Accordingly he re-entered the bark and returned. Now the man out of whom the demons were gone, entreated his permiſſion to attend him,*
39 *But Jeſus diſmiſſed him, ſaying,* Return home and relate what great things

things God hath done for thee. *Then he departed and publiſhed through*
40 *all the city what great things Jeſus had done for him. Jeſus, at his*
return, was welcomed by the crowd, who were all waiting for him.
41 *Meantime came a man named Jairus, a ruler of the ſynagogue,* Mat. 9; 18.
who, throwing himſelf at the feet of Jeſus, beſought him to come into Mar. 5; 22.
42 *his houſe: for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, who*
was dying.
43 *As Jeſus went along, the people crowded him; and a woman, who* Mar. 5; 25.
had been twelve years afflicted with an iſſue of blood, and had conſumed
44 *all her living upon phyſicians, none of whom could cure her, coming be-*
hind touched the tuft of his mantle; upon which her iſſue was ſtanched.
45 *Then Jeſus ſaid,* Who touched me? *When every body denied, Peter,*
and thoſe with him, anſwered, Maſter, the multitude throng and preſs
46 thee, and doſt thou ſay, 'Who touched me?' *Jeſus replied,* Some-
body hath touched me; for I am ſenſible that my power was juſt
47 now exerted. *Then the woman perceiving that ſhe was diſcovered,*
came trembling, and having thrown herſelf proſtrate, declared to him,
before all the people, why ſhe had touched him, and how ſhe had been im-
48 *mediately healed: and he ſaid to her,* Daughter, take courage, thy
faith hath cured thee; go in peace.
49 *While he was yet ſpeaking, one came from the houſe of the director* Mar. 5; 35.
of the ſynagogue, who ſaid, Thy daughter is dead, trouble not the
50 Teacher. *Jeſus hearing this, ſaid to Jairus,* Fear not; only be-
51 lieve, and ſhe ſhall be well. *Being come to the houſe, he allowed* Mat. 9; 23.
nobody to enter with him, except Peter and John and James, and
52 *the maiden's father and mother. And all wept and lamented her.*
53 *But he ſaid,* Weep not; ſhe is not dead, but aſleep. *And they*
54 *derided him, knowing that ſhe was dead. But he, having made them*
all retire, took her by the hand, and called, ſaying, Maiden, ariſe.
55 *And her ſpirit returned, and ſhe aroſe immediately, and he commanded*
56 *to give her food. And her parents were aſtoniſhed, but he charged*
them not to mention to any body what had happened.

IX. *JESUS having convened the twelve, gave them power and au-* Mat. 10; 1.
2 *thority over all the demons, and to cure diſeaſes, and commiſſioned them* Mar. 3; 13.
3 *to proclaim the reign of God, and to heal the ſick. And he ſaid to them,* Mat. 10; 7.
Mar. 6; 7.
Provide nothing for your journey; nor ſtaves, nor bag, nor bread,
4 nor ſilver, nor two coats a-piece; and continue in whatever houſe Mat. 10; 11.
5 ye are received into, until ye leave the place. And whereſoever Acts, 13; 51.
they will not receive you, ſhake even the duſt off your feet, as a
6 proteſtation againſt them. *They accordingly departed, and travelled*
through the villages, publiſhing the good tidings, and performing cures
every where.

Now

Mat. 14; 1. Mar. 6; 14. 7 *Now Herod the tetrarch having heard of all that Jeſus had done,* 8 *was perplexed, becauſe ſome ſaid,* John is riſen from the dead; *ſome,* Elijah hath appeared; *and others,* One of the ancient Prophets is 9 riſen again. *And Herod ſaid,* John I beheaded: but who is this of whom I hear ſuch things? *And he was deſirous to ſee him.*

Mat. 14; 13. Mar. 6; 32. 10 *Now the Apoſtles being returned, reported to Jeſus all that they had done: and he, taking them with him, retired privately to a deſert belong-* 11 *ing to the city of Bethſaida. When the multitude knew it they followed him; and he receiving them, ſpoke to them concerning the reign of God, and healed thoſe who had need of healing.*

Mat. 14; 15. Mar. 6; 35. Jo. 6; 5. 12 *When the day began to decline, the twelve accoſting him, ſaid,* Diſmiſs the people, that they may go to the neareſt towns and villages, and provide themſelves in lodging and food; for we are here in 13 a deſert. *He anſwered,* Supply them yourſelves with food. *They replied,* We have only five loaves and two fiſhes; unleſs we go and 14 buy victuals for all this people. *For they were about five thouſand men. Then he ſaid to his diſciples,* Make them lie down in parties, 15 fifty in a party. *And they did ſo, making them all lie down.* 16 *Then he took the five loaves and the two fiſhes; and looking up to heaven, he bleſſed and brake them, and gave them to his diſciples to ſet* 17 *before the multitude. When all had eaten, and were ſatisfied, they took up twelve baſkets full of fragments.*

SECTION VII.

The Transfiguration.

Mat. 16; 13. Mar. 8; 27. 18 *AFTERWARDS having withdrawn from the multitude to pray apart with his diſciples, he aſked them, ſaying,* Who do people ſay 19 that I am? *They anſwered,* John the Baptiſt; others ſay, Elijah; 20 and others, that one of the ancient Prophets is riſen again. *He ſaid to them,* But who ſay ye that I am? *Peter anſwered,* The 21 Meſſiah of God. *Then having ſtrictly charged them, he prohibited* 22 *them from telling this to any body, adding,* The Son of Man muſt ſuffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and chief prieſts and ſcribes, and be killed, and riſe again the third day.

Mat. 10; 38. and 16; 24. Mar. 8; 34. ch. 14; 27. & 17; 33. Jo. 12; 25. Mat. 10; 33. 2 Tim. 2; 12. 23 *Then he ſaid to all the people,* If any man will come under my guidance, let him renounce himſelf, and take his croſs daily, and 24 follow me. For whoſoever would ſave his life, ſhall loſe it; and 25 whoſoever will loſe his life for my ſake, ſhall ſave it. What will it profit a man to gain the whole world, with the forfeit or ruin of 26 himſelf? For whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me and of my words, of him the Son of Man will be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in his

glory, and in the glory of the Father, and of the holy meſſengers.
27 I certify you, that there are ſome ſtanding here, who ſhall not taſte death until they ſee the reign of God.

28 *ABOUT eight days after this diſcourſe, he took with him Peter,* Mat. 17; 1.
and John, and James, and went up upon a mountain to pray. Mar. 9; 2.
29 *While he prayed, the appearance of his countenance was changed and his*
30 *raiment contracted a dazzling whiteneſs. And behold, two men of a*
31 *glorious aſpect, Moſes and Elijah, converſed with him, and ſpoke of*
32 *the departure which he was to accompliſh at Jeruſalem. Now Peter, and thoſe that were with him, were overpowered with ſleep; but when they awoke, they ſaw his glory, and the two men that ſtood with him.*
33 *As theſe were removing from Jeſus, Peter ſaid to him, not knowing what he ſaid,* Maſter, it is good for us to ſtay here: let us then make
34 three booths, one for thee, one for Moſes, and one Elijah. *While he was ſpeaking, a cloud came and covered them, and they feared as they*
35 *entered the cloud: from the cloud a voice came, which ſaid,* This is my
36 beloved Son, hear him. *While the voice was uttered, Jeſus was found alone. And this they kept ſecret, telling nobody in thoſe days aught of what they had ſeen.*

37 *The next day, when they were come down from the mountain, a great* Mat. 17; 14.
38 *multitude met him. And one of the crowd cried out, ſaying,* Rabbi, I Mar. 9; 14.
39 beſeech thee, take pity on my ſon; for he is my only child. And lo a ſpirit ſeizeth him, making him inſtantly cry out, and fall into convulſions, ſo that he foameth; and after he is much bruiſed, hardly
40 leaveth him. And I beſought thy diſciples to expel the demon; but
41 they were not able. *Then Jeſus anſwering ſaid,* O incredulous and perverſe generation; how long ſhall I be with you, and ſuffer you? Bring thy ſon hither. *And as he was coming, the demon threw him*
42 *down in convulſions. And Jeſus rebuked the unclean ſpirit, and having*
43 *cured the child, delivered him to his father. And they were all amazed at the great power of God.*

While all were admiring every thing which Jeſus did, he ſaid to Mat. 17; 22.
44 *his diſciples,* Mark diligently theſe words, 'The Son of Man is to be Mar. 9; 31.
45 'delivered into the hands of men.' *But they underſtood not this language; it was veiled to them, that they might not apprehend it; and they were afraid to aſk him concerning it.*

46 *And there aroſe a debate among them, which of them ſhould be greateſt.* Mat. 18; 1.
47 *But Jeſus, who perceived the thought of their heart, took a child, and* Mar. 9; 33.
48 *placing him near himſelf, ſaid to them,* Whoſoever ſhall receive this child for my ſake, receiveth me; and whoſoever ſhall receive me, receiveth him who ſent me: for he who is leaſt amongſt you all ſhall be greateſt.

Mar. 9; 38. 49 *Then John said*, Master, we saw one expelling demons in thy name, and we forbade him, because he consorteth not with us.
50 *Jesus answered*, Forbid not such; for whoever is not against us, is for us.

51 *NOW as the time of his removal approached, he set out resolutely*
52 *for Jerusalem, and sent messengers before, who went into a village of*
53 *the Samaritans, to make preparation for him. But they would not admit*
54 *him, because they perceived he was going to Jerusalem. His disciples, James and John, observing this, said*, Master, wilt thou that we call
2 Ki. 1; 9. 55 down fire from heaven to consume them, as Elijah did? *But he turned*
Jo. 3; 17. 56 *and rebuked them, saying*, Ye know not what spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is come, not to destroy men, but to save them. *Then they went to another village.*

Mat. 8; 19. 57 *As they were on the way, one said to him*, Master, I will follow thee
58 whithersoever thou goest. *Jesus answered*, The foxes have caverns, and the birds of the air have places of shelter, but the Son of Man hath not where to repose his head.

Mat. 8; 21. 59 *He said to another*, Follow me. *He answered*, Sir, permit me first
60 to go and bury my father. *Jesus replied*, Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and publish the reign of God.
61 *Another likewise said*, I will follow thee, Sir, but first permit me
62 to take leave of my family. *Jesus answered*, No man who, having put his hand to the plough, looketh behind him, is fit for the kingdom of God.

X. *AFTERWARDS the Lord appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before him, into every city and place whither he in-*
Mat. 9; 37. 2 *tended to go. And he said to them*, The harvest is plentiful, but the reapers are few: pray therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would
Mat. 10; 16. 3 send labourers to reap it. Go, then; behold I send you forth as
Mat. 10; 9. 4 lambs amidst wolves. Carry no purse, nor bag, nor shoes, and sa-
Mar. 6; 8. 5 lute no person by the way. Whatever house ye enter, say, first,
Mat. 10; 12. 6 'Peace be to this house.' And if a son of peace be there, your peace
7 shall rest upon him; if not, it shall return upon yourselves. But re-
1 Tim. 5; 18. main in the same house, eating and drinking such things as it affordeth; for the workman is worthy of his wages: go not from house
8 to house. And whatever city ye enter, if they receive you, eat such
9 things as are set before you; cure their sick, and say to them, 'The
Acts, 13; 51. 10 'reign of God cometh upon you.' But whatever city ye enter, if
11 they do not receive you, go out into the streets, and say, 'The very 'dirt of your streets, which cleaveth to us, we wipe off against 'you: know, however, that the reign of God cometh upon you.'

12 I assure you that the condition of Sodom shall be more tolerable on that day, than the condition of that city.
13 Woe unto thee Chorazin, woe unto thee Bethsaida; for if the miracles which have been performed in you, had been performed in Tyre and Sidon, they had repented long ago, sitting in sack- Mat. 11; 21.
14 cloth and ashes. Wherefore the condition of Tyre and Sidon
15 shall be more tolerable in the judgment than yours. And thou Capernaum, which hast been exalted to heaven, shalt be thrown
16 down to hades. He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me, rejecteth him who sent me. Mat. 10; 40. Jo. 13; 20.
17 *And the seventy returned with joy, saying*, Master, even the demons
18 are subject unto us through thy name. *He said to them*, I beheld Satan
19 fall like lightning from heaven. Lo, I empower you to tread on serpents and scorpions, and all the might of the enemy; and nothing
20 shall hurt you. Nevertheless, rejoice not in this, that the spirits are subject unto you? but rejoice that your names are enrolled in
21 heaven. *At that time Jesus was joyful in spirit, and said*, I adore thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because having hidden these things from sages and the learned, thou hast revealed them Mat. 11; 25.
22 unto babes. Yes, Father, because such is thy pleasure. My Father hath imparted every thing to me; and none knoweth who the Son is, except the Father; nor who the Father is, except Jo. 3; 35. 6; 46. & 10; 15.
23 the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him. *Then turning, he said apart to his disciples*, Blessed are the eyes which Mat. 13; 16.
24 see what ye see. For I assure you that many Prophets and kings have wished to see the things which ye see, but have not seen them, and to hear the things which ye hear, but have not heard them.

25 *THEN a lawyer stood up, and said, trying him*, Rabbi, what Mat. 22; 35.
26 must I do to obtain eternal life? *Jesus said unto him*, How doth the Mar. 12; 28.
27 law answer this? What readest thou there? *He answered*, "Thou Deut. 6; 5.
"shalt love the Lord (o) thy God with all thy heart, and with Lev. 19; 18.
"all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind,
28 "and thy neighbour as thyself." *Jesus replied*, Thou hast answered right. Do this, and thou shalt live.
29 *But he, desirous to appear blameless, said to Jesus*, Who is my
30 neighbour? *Jesus said in return*, A man of Jerusalem, travelling to Jericho, fell among robbers, who having stripped and wounded him,
31 went away, leaving him half dead. A priest accidentally going that
32 way, and seeing him, passed by on the farther side. Likewise a Levite

(o) Jehovah.

vite on the road, when he came near the place, and ſaw him, paſſed
33 by on the farther ſide. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed,
34 came where he was, and when he ſaw him, he had compaſſion, and went up to him, and having poured oil and wine into his wounds, he bound them up. Then he ſet him on his own beaſt, brought him
35 to an inn, and took care of him. On the morrow, when he was going away, he took out two denarii *(p)*, and giving them to the hoſt, ſaid, 'Take care of this man, and whatever thou ſpendeſt more,
36 'when I return, I will repay thee.' Now which of theſe three, thinkeſt thou, was neighbour to him who fell among the robbers?
37 *The lawyer anſwered*, He who took pity upon him. *Then ſaid Jeſus*, Go thou, and do in like manner.

38 *AND as they travelled, he went into a village, where a woman*
39 *named Martha entertained him at her houſe. She had a ſiſter called*
40 *Mary who ſat at the feet of Jeſus, liſtening to his diſcourſe. But Martha, who was much cumbered about ſerving, came to him and ſaid*, Maſter, careſt thou not that my ſiſter leaveth me to ſerve alone? Bid
41 her therefore aſſiſt me. *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto her*, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious, and troubleſt thyſelf about many things.
42 One thing only is neceſſary. And Mary hath choſen that good part which ſhall not be taken from her.

SECTION VIII.

The Character of the Phariſees.

XI. *IT happened that he was praying in a certain place, and when he had done, one of his diſciples ſaid to him*, Maſter, teach us to pray, as
Mat. 6; 9. 2 John alſo taught his diſciples. *He anſwered*, When ye pray, ſay, ['Our] Father, [who art in heaven,] thy name be hallowed; thy
'reign come; [thy will be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven;]
3 'give us each day our daily bread; and forgive us our ſins, for even
'we forgive all who offend us; and abandon us not to temptation,
'[but preſerve us from evil.']
5 *Moreover, he ſaid unto them*, Should one of you have a friend, and
6 go to him at midnight, and ſay, 'Friend, lend me three loaves; for
'a friend of mine is come off his road to ſee me, and I have nothing
7 to ſet before him;' and he from within ſhould anſwer, 'Do not diſ-
'turb me; the door is now locked; I and my children are in bed;
8 'I cannot riſe to give thee:' I tell you, [if the other continue knock-

(p) About 1 s. 3 d. ſterling.

knocking, | though he will not riſe and ſupply him, becauſe he is his friend; he will, becauſe of his importunity, get up and give him as
9 many as he wanteth. I likewiſe tell you, Aſk, and ye ſhall obtain; ſeek, Mat. 7; 7.
10 and ye ſhall find; knock, and the door ſhall be opened to you: for & 21; 22. Mar. 11; 24. Jo. 16; 24.
whoſoever aſketh, obtaineth; whoſoever ſeeketh, findeth; and to
11 every one who knocketh, the door is opened. What father amongſt Ja. 1; 5.
you would give his ſon a ſtone, when he aſketh bread; or when he
12 aſketh a fiſh, would, inſtead of a fiſh, give him a ſerpent; or when
13 he aſketh an egg, would give him a ſcorpion? If ye, therefore, bad as ye are, can give good things to your children; how much more will your Father give from heaven the Holy Spirit to them that aſk him?

14 *ONE time he was expelling a demon which cauſed dumbneſs, and* Mat. 9; 32. & 12; 22.
when the demon was gone out, the dumb ſpake, and the people wondered.
15 *Some however ſaid,* He expelleth demons by Beelzebub prince of the Mar. 3; 22.
16 demons. *(Others to try him, aſked of him a ſign in the ſky). But he*
knowing their thoughts, ſaid to them, By inteſtine broils any kingdom
18 may be deſolated, one family falling after another. Now, if there be inteſtine broils in the kingdom of Satan, how can that kingdom ſub-
19 ſiſt? for ye ſay that I expel demons by Beelzebub. Moreover, if I by Beelzebub expel demons, by whom do your ſons expel them?
20 Wherefore they ſhall be your judges. But if I by the finger of God
21 expel demons, the reign of God hath overtaken you. When a ſtrong man armed guardeth the entrance into his houſe, his effects are ſecure.
22 But if a ſtronger than he ſhall attack and overcome him, he will ſtrip him of his armour on which he relied, and diſpoſe of his ſpoils.
23 He who is not for me, is againſt me; and he who gathereth not with me, ſcattereth.

24 The unclean ſpirit, when he is gone out of a man, wandereth over Mat. 12; 43.
parched deſerts, in ſearch of a reſting-place. But not finding any, he
25 ſaith, 'I will return to my houſe whence I came.' Being come, he
26 findeth it ſwept and furniſhed. Whereupon he goeth, and bringeth ſeven other ſpirits more wicked than himſelf; and having entered, they dwell there, and the laſt ſtate of that man becometh worſe than 2 Pet. 2; 20. Heb. 6; 4. & 10; 26.
the firſt.
27 *While he was ſaying theſe things, a woman raiſing her voice, cried to*
him from amid the crowd, Happy the womb which bore thee, and the
28 breaſts which ſuckled thee. Say, rather, *replied he,* Happy they who hear the word of God and obey it.

29 *When the people crowded together, he began to ſay,* This is an evil Mat. 12; 38. & 16; 4.
generation. They demand a ſign; but no ſign ſhall be given them,
30 ſave the ſign of the Prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was a ſign to the Ninevites, ſo ſhall the Son of Man be to this generation.

1 Ki. 10; 1. 2 Chro. 9; 1. 31 The queen of the South (*q*) country will ariſe in the judgment againſt the men of this generation, and cauſe them to be condemned; becauſe ſhe came from the extremities of the earth to hear the wiſe diſcourſes of Solomon; and behold here is ſomething greater than
Jon. 3; 5. 32 Solomon. The men of Nineveh will ſtand up in the judgment againſt this generation, and cauſe it to be condemned; becauſe they repented when warned by Jonah; and behold here is ſomething greater than Jonah.

Mat. 5; 15. Mar. 4; 21. 33 A lamp is lighted, not to be concealed or put under a corn-meaſure, but on a ſtand, that they who enter may have light.
Mat. 6; 22. 34 The lamp of the body is the eye: when therefore thine eye is ſound, thy whole body is enlightened; but when thine eye is
35 diſtempered, thy body is in darkneſs. Take heed then leſt the
36 light which is in thee be darkneſs. If thy whole body, therefore, be enlightened, having no part dark, the whole will in ſuch a manner be enlightened, as when a lamp lighteth thee by its flame.

37 *While he was ſpeaking, a phariſee aſked him to dine with him.*
38 *And he went and placed himſelf at table. But the phariſee was ſur-*
39 *priſed to obſerve, that he uſed no waſhing before dinner. Then the*
Mat. 23; 25. *Lord ſaid to him,* As for you phariſees, ye cleanſe the outſide of your cups and diſhes, while ye yourſelves are inwardly full of rapacity
40 and malevolence. Unthinking men! did not he who made the
41 outſide, make the inſide alſo? Only give in alms what ye have, and all things ſhall be clean unto you.

Mat. 23; 23. 42 Woe unto you, phariſees, becauſe you pay the tithe of mint and rue, and every kind of herb, and neglect juſtice and the love of God. Theſe things ye ought to have practiſed, and not to have omitted thoſe.

Mat. 23; 6. 43 Woe unto you phariſees, becauſe you love the moſt conſpicuous ſeat in ſynagogues, and ſalutations in public places.

44 Woe unto you, ſcribes and phariſees, hypocrites, becauſe ye are like concealed graves, over which people walk without knowing it.

45 *Here one of the lawyers interpoſing, ſaid,* By ſpeaking thus,
Mat. 23; 4. 46 Rabbi, thou reproacheſt us alſo. *He anſwered,* Woe unto you, lawyers, alſo, becauſe ye lade men with intolerable burdens, burdens which ye yourſelves will not ſo much as touch with one of your fingers.

Mat. 23; 29. 47 Woe unto you, becauſe ye build the monuments of the Prophets,
48 whom your fathers killed. Surely ye are both vouchers and acceſſories to the deeds of your fathers; for they killed them, and ye build their monuments.

49 Where-

(*q*) In the Old Teſtament *Sheba.*

49 Wherefore, thus ſaith the wiſdom of God, 'I will ſend them Pro- Mat. 23; 34.
'phets and Apoſtles; ſome of them they will kill, others they will
50 'baniſh; inſomuch that the blood of all the Prophets which hath
'been ſhed ſince the formation of the world, ſhall be required of this
51 'generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who Gen. 4; 8.
'fell between the altar and the houſe of God.' Yes, I aſſure you; 2Chr. 24; 20.
all ſhall be required of this generation.
52 Woe unto you, lawyers, becauſe ye have carried off the key of know- Mat. 23; 13.
ledge; ye have not entered yourſelves, and thoſe who were entering,
ye hindered.
53 *While he ſpake theſe things, the ſcribes and the phariſees began ve-*
54 *hemently to preſs him with queſtions on many points; laying ſnares for*
him, in order to draw from his own mouth matter of accuſation againſt
him.

XII. *MEANTIME, while the crowd in myriads flocked about him, in-*
ſomuch that they trod one upon another, he ſaid, addreſſing himſelf to his Mat. 16; 6.
diſciples, Above all things, beware of the leaven of the phariſees, Mar. 8; 15.
2 which is hypocriſy. For there is nothing covered that ſhall not be Mat. 10; 26.
3 detected; nothing ſecret that ſhall not be known. What ye have Mar. 4; 22.
ſpoken in the dark, ſhall be reported in the light; and what ye have
whiſpered in the cloſet, ſhall be proclaimed from the houſe-top.
4 But I charge you, my friends, fear not them who kill the body, and
5 after that can do no more: but I will ſhow you whom ye ought to
fear; fear him who, after he hath killed, hath power to caſt into
6 hell. I repeat it to you, fear him. Are not five ſparrows ſold for
7 two pence (*r*)? Yet not one of them is forgotten of God: yea, the
very hairs of your head are all numbered: fear not, therefore; ye are
8 much more valuable than ſparrows. Moreover, I ſay unto you,
Whoever ſhall acknowledge me before men, him the Son of Man
9 will acknowledge before the angels of God: but whoever denieth Mar. 8; 38.
10 me before men, ſhall be diſowned before the angels of God. And 2 Ti. 2; 12.
Mat. 12; 32.
whoſo ſhall inveigh againſt the Son of Man, may obtain remiſſion; Mar. 3; 28.
but to him who detracteth from the Holy Spirit, there is no remiſ- 1 Jo. 5; 16
11 ſion. And when ye are brought before ſynagogues, and magiſtrates, Mat. 10; 19.
and rulers, be not ſolicitous, how or what ye ſhall anſwer, or what Mat. 13; 11.
12 ye ſhall ſay: for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that moment
what ought to be ſaid.

13 *THEN one ſaid to him out of the crowd*, Rabbi, order my brother
14 to divide the inheritance with me. *He anſwered*, Man, who conſti-
15 tuted me your judge or arbiter? *And he ſaid to them*, Be upon your
guard

(*r*) Value *three halfpence* of our money.

guard againſt covetouſneſs; for in whatever affluence a man be, his life dependeth not on his poſſeſſions.

16 *He alſo uſed this example:* A certain rich man had lands which
17 brought forth plentifully. And he reaſoned thus with himſelf,
Eccluſ. 11; 18 What will I do; for I have not where to ſtore up my crop?—I
19. will do this, added he, I will pull down my barns, and build larger,
19 and there I will ſtore up all my product and my goods. And I
will ſay to my ſoul, 'Soul, thou haſt plenty of goods laid up for
20 'many years, take thine eaſe, eat, drink, enjoy thyſelf.' But God
ſaid to him, 'Thou fool, this very night thy ſoul is required of thee.
21 'Whoſe then ſhall thoſe things be which thou haſt provided?' So
it fareth with him who amaſſeth treaſure for himſelf, but is not rich
towards God.

Mat. 6; 25. Pſ. 55; 22. 1 Pet. 5; 7. 22 *Then he ſaid to his diſciples,* For this reaſon I charge you, be
not anxious about your life, what ye ſhall eat; nor about your body,
23 what ye ſhall wear. Life is a greater gift than food, and the body
24 than raiment. Conſider the ravens; they neither ſow nor reap;
have neither cellar nor barn; but God feedeth them. How much
25 more valuable are ye than the fowls? Beſides, which of you can, by his
26 anxiety, prolong his life one hour? If, therefore, ye cannot thus effect
27 even the ſmalleſt thing, why are ye anxious about the reſt? Conſider
the lilies. How do they grow? They toil not; they ſpin not; yet I
affirm, that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not equally adorned
28 with one of theſe. If, then, God ſo array the herbage, which to-day
is in the field, and to-morrow is caſt into the oven; how much
29 will he array you, O ye diſtruſtful? Aſk not ye, therefore, what ye
30 ſhall eat, or what ye ſhall drink; live not in anxious ſuſpenſe. For
all theſe things the Pagans ſeek; whereas your Father knoweth that
31 ye need them. But ſeek ye the kingdom of God, and all theſe things
32 ſhall be ſuperadded to you. Fear not, my little flock, for it hath
Mat. 6; 20. & 19; 21. 33 pleaſed your Father to give you the kingdom. Sell your goods and
give alms; provide yourſelves purſes which wear not out; treaſure
inexauſtible in heaven, where no thieves approach, where nothing
34 is ſpoiled by worms. For where your treaſure is, your heart will
likewiſe be.

1 Pet. 1; 13. 35 Let your loins be girt, and your lamps burning; and yourſelves
like thoſe who wait their maſter's return from the wedding; that when
37 he cometh and knocketh, they may immediately let him in. Happy
thoſe ſervants whom their maſter, at his return, ſhall find watching.
Verily I ſay unto you, that he will gird himſelf, and having placed
38 them at table, will attend and ſerve them. And whether he come in
the ſecond watch, or in the third; if he find things thus, happy are thoſe
Mat. 24; 43. 1 Th. 5; 2. Rev. 3; 3. & 16; 15. 39 ſervants. Ye are certain, that if the maſter of the houſe knew at what
hour the thief would come, he would watch, and not allow him to

40 break into his houſe. Be ye then always prepared; becauſe the
Son of Man will come at an hour when ye are not expecting
him.
41 *Then Peter ſaid to him*, Maſter, is this compariſon directed to us
42 alone, or to all preſent? *The Lord ſaid*, Who now is the diſcreet
and faithful ſteward, whom the maſter will ſet over his houſehold,
43 to diſpenſe regularly the allowance of corn? Happy that ſervant, if
44 his maſter, at his arrival, ſhall find him ſo employed. I tell you
truly, he will entruſt him with the management of all his eſtate.
45 But as to the ſervant who ſhall ſay within himſelf, 'My maſter de-
layeth his return,' and ſhall preſume to beat the men-ſervants
46 and the maids, and to feaſt and carouſe, and be drunken; the maſter
of that ſervant will come on a day when he is not expecting him,
and at an hour he is not appriſed of, and having diſcarded him, will
47 aſſign him his portion with the faithleſs. And that ſervant who
knew his maſter's will, yet did not make himſelf ready, nor execute Ja. 4; 17.
48 his orders, ſhall receive many ſtripes: whereas he who knew it not,
but did things deſerving chaſtiſement, ſhall receive few: for much
will be required of every one to whom much is given; and the more
a man is entruſted with, the more will be exacted from him.
49 I came to throw fire upon the earth; and what would I but that
50 it were kindled? I have an immerſion to undergo; and how am I
51 pained till it be accompliſhed? Do ye imagine that I am come to give
52 peace to the earth? I tell you, No, but diviſion. For hereafter five Mat. 10; 34.
in one family will be divided; three againſt two, and two againſt
53 three; father againſt ſon, and ſon againſt father; mother againſt
daughter, and daughter againſt mother; mother-in-law againſt
daughter-in-law, and daughter-in-law againſt mother-in-law.
54 *He ſaid alſo to the people*, When ye ſee a cloud riſing in the weſt, Mat. 16; 2.
55 ye ſay, 'It will rain immediately,' and ſo it happeneth: and when
the ſouth wind bloweth, ye ſay, 'It will be hot,' and it happeneth
56 accordingly. Hypocrites, ye can judge of what appeareth in the ſky,
and on the earth; how is it that ye cannot judge of the preſent time?
57 and why do ye not even of yourſelves diſcern what is juſt?
58 When thou goeſt with thy creditor to the magiſtrate, endeavour Mat. 5; 25.
on the road to ſatisfy him, leſt he drag thee before the judge, and the
judge conſign thee to the ſergeant, and the ſergeant commit thee to
59 priſon: I aſſure thee, thou wilt not be releaſed, until thou haſt paid
the laſt mite.

SECTION IX.

The Nature of the Kingdom.

XIII. *THERE were then present some who informed him of the Gali-*
leans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with that of their sa-
2 *crifices. Jesus, answering, said unto them,* Think ye that these
Galileans were the greatest sinners in all Galilee, because they suffered
3 such usage? I tell you, 'No; but unless ye reform, ye shall all
4 'likewise perish:' or those eighteen whom the tower of Siloam fell
upon and slew; think ye that they were the greatest profligates
5 in all Jerusalem? I tell you, No: but unless ye reform, ye also shall
perish.
6 *He also spake this parable.* A man had a fig-tree planted in his
7 vineyard, and came seeking fruit on it, but found none. Then
he said to the vine-dresser, 'This is the third year that I have
'come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, without finding any. Cut
8 'it down, why should it cumber the ground?' He answered, 'Sir,
'let it alone one year longer, until I dig about it and dung it;
9 'perhaps it will bear fruit: if not, thou mayest afterwards cut it
'down.'

10 *ONE Sabbath, as he was teaching in a synagogue, a woman was*
present who had for eighteen years had a spirit of infirmity, whereby she
12 *was so bowed down, that she could not so much as look up. Jesus, per-*
13 *ceiving her, called her to him, and laying his hands on her, said,* Woman,
thou art delivered from thine infirmity. *Immediately she stood upright*
14 *and glorified God. But the director of the synagogue, moved with*
indignation because Jesus had performed a cure on the Sabbath, said
to the people, There are six days for working; come, therefore,
15 on those days, and be healed, and not on the Sabbath-day. *To which*
the Lord replied, Hypocrites, who is there amongst you, that doth
not on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall and lead him
16 away to watering? And must not this woman, a daughter of Abra-
ham, whom Satan hath kept bound, lo, these eighteen years, be re-
17 leased from this bond on the Sabbath-day? *On his saying this, all his*
opposers were ashamed; but the whole multitude was delighted with all
the glorious actions performed by him.

Mat. 13; 31. 18 *He said, moreover,* What doth the kingdom of God resemble?
Mar. 4; 31. 19 Whereunto shall I compare it? It resembleth a grain of mustard seed,
which a man threw into his garden; and it grew and became a great
tree, and the birds of the air took shelter in its branches.

20 *Again*

20 *Again he ſaid*, Whereunto ſhall I compare the kingdom of God? Mat. 13; 33.
21 It reſembleth leaven which a woman mingled in three meaſures of meal, until the whole was leavened.

22 *AND he took a journey to Jeruſalem, teaching as he paſſed through* Mat. 9; 35.
23 *cities and villages; and one aſked him*, Maſter, are there but few who
24 ſhall be ſaved? *He anſwered*, Force your entrance through the ſtrait Mat. 7; 13.
gate; for many, I aſſure, will requeſt to be admitted, who ſhall not
25 prevail. If once the maſter of the houſe ſhall have ariſen and locked Mat. 25; 10.
the door, and ye ſtanding without and knocking, ſay, 'Maſter, maſ-
'ter, open unto us,' he will anſwer, 'I know not whence ye are.'
26 Then ye will ſay, 'We have eaten and drunk with thee, and thou
27 'haſt taught in our ſtreets.' But he will anſwer, 'I tell you, I know
'not whence ye are: remove hence all ye workers of unrighteouſneſs.'
28 Then will enſue weeping and gnaſhing of teeth, when ye ſhall ſee Mat. 7; 23.
Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, received into & 25; 41.
29 the kingdom of God, and yourſelves excluded: nay, people will
come from the eaſt, from the weſt, from the north, and from the
ſouth, and will place themſelves at table in the kingdom of God.
30 And behold they are laſt, who ſhall be firſt, and they are firſt who Mat. 19; 30.
ſhall be laſt, Mar. 10; 31.
31 *The ſame day certain phariſees came to him and ſaid*, Get away;
32 depart hence, for Herod intendeth to kill thee. *He anſwered*, Go
tell that fox, To-day and to-morrow I expel demons and perform
33 cures, and the third day my courſe will be completed. Nevertheleſs
I muſt walk about to-day and to-morrow, and the day following;
for it cannot be that a prophet ſhould be cut off any where but at
34 Jeruſalem. O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, that killeſt the prophets, and Mat. 23; 37.
ſtoneſt them whom God ſendeth to thee; how often would I have
gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood under
35 her wings, but ye would not. Quickly ſhall your habitation be trans-
formed into a deſert; for verily I ſay unto you, ye ſhall not again
ſee me, until the time when ye ſhall ſay, "Bleſſed be he who cometh
"in the name of the Lord (*s*)."

XIV. *IT happened on a Sabbath, as he went to eat at the houſe one of*
the rulers who was a phariſee, that, while the phariſees were obſerving
2. *him, a man who had a dropſy ſtood before him. Then Jeſus, addreſſing*
himſelf to the lawyers and phariſees, ſaid, Is it lawful to cure on the
4 Sabbath? *They being ſilent, he took hold of the man, healed and diſmiſſed*
5 *him. Then reſuming his diſcourſe, he ſaid to them*, Who amongſt
you, if his aſs or his ox fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will
not

(*s*) Jehovah.

6 not immediately pull him out? *And to this they were not able to make him a reply.*

7 *Obſerving how eager the gueſts were to poſſeſs the higher places at*
8 *table, he gave them this injunction,* When thou art invited to a wedding, do not occupy the higheſt place at table, leſt one more conſiderable
9 than thou be bidden, and he who invited you both come and ſay to thee, Give place to this man, and thou ſhouldſt then riſe with confu-
10 ſion to take the loweſt place. But when thou art invited, go to the
Prov. 25; 7. loweſt place, that when he who bade thee cometh, he may ſay to thee, 'Friend, go up higher;' for that will do thee honour before the
ch. 18; 14. 11 company. For whoever exalteth himſelf, ſhall be humbled; and
Mat. 23; 12. whoever humbleth himſelf, ſhall be exalted.

12 *He ſaid alſo to him who had invited him,* When thou giveſt a dinner or a ſupper, do not invite thy rich friends, brothers, couſins, or neighbours, leſt they alſo invite thee in their turn, and thou be
13 recompenſed. But when thou giveſt an entertainment, invite the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou ſhalt be happy:
14 for as they have not wherewith to requite thee, thou ſhalt be requited at the reſurrection of the righteous.

15 *One of the gueſts hearing this ſaid to him,* Happy he who ſhall
Mat. 22; 2. 16 feaſt in the reign of God. *Jeſus ſaid to him,* A certain man made
Rev. 19; 9. 17 a great ſupper and invited many. And at ſupper-time he ſent his ſervants to tell thoſe who had been bidden to come preſently;
18 for that all was ready. But they all, without exception made excuſes. One ſaid, 'I have purchaſed a field, which I muſt go and
19 'ſee; I pray thee have me excuſed.' Another ſaid, 'I have bought
'five yoke of oxen, which I am going to prove; I pray thee, have me
20 'excuſed.' A third ſaid, 'I have married a wife and therefore I can-
21 'not go.' The ſervant being returned, related all to his maſter. Then the maſter of the houſe was angry, and ſaid to his ſervants, 'Go forthwith into the ſtreets and lanes of the city, and bring
22 'in hither the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind.' Afterwards the ſervant ſaid, 'Sir, thy orders are executed, and ſtill there
23 'is room.' The maſter anſwered, 'Go out into the highways,
'and along the hedges, and compel people to come, that my houſe
24 'may be filled: for I declare to you, that none of thoſe who were
'invited ſhall taſte of my ſupper.'

25 *AS great multitudes travelled along with him, he turned to them*
Mat. 10; 37. 26 *and ſaid,* If any man come to me and hate not his father and
and 16; 24. Mar. 8; 34. mother, and wife and children, and brothers and ſiſters; nay,
27 and himſelf too, he cannot be my diſciple. And whoſoever doth not follow me carrying his croſs, cannot be my diſciple.
28 For which of you intending to build a tower, doth not firſt by

himſelf compute the expence, to know whether he have where-
29 with to complete it; leſt, having laid the foundation, and being
30 unable to finiſh, he become the deriſion of all who ſee it, who
will ſay, 'This man began to build, but was not able to finiſh.'
31 Or what king going to engage another king with whom he is at
war, doth not firſt conſult by himſelf, whether he can with ten
thouſand men, encounter him who cometh againſt him with
32 twenty thouſand; that, if he cannot, he may, while the other
33 is at a diſtance, ſend an embaſſy to ſue for peace. So then,
whoſoever he be of you, who doth not renounce all that he hath,
34 he cannot be my diſciple. Salt is good; but if the ſalt become inſi- Mat. 5; 13.
35 pid wherewith ſhall it be ſeaſoned? It is fit neither for the land nor Mar. 9; 50.
for the dunghill, but is thrown away. Whoſo hath ears to hear, let
him hear.

SECTION X.

Parables.

XV. NOW *all the publicans and ſinners reſorted to him to hear him.*
2 *But the phariſees and the ſcribes murmured, ſaying*, This man
admitteth ſinners, and eateth with them.
3. *Then he addreſſed this ſimilitude to them:* What man amongſt you, Mat. 18; 12.
who hath an hundred ſheep, if he loſe one of them, doth not leave the
ninety-nine in the deſert, to go after that which is loſt, until he find
5 it? And having found it, doth he not joyfully lay it on his ſhoulders,
6 and, when he is come home, convene his friends and neigh-
bours, ſaying to them, 'Rejoice with me, for I have found my ſheep
7 'which was loſt?' Thus, I aſſure you, there is greater joy in heaven
for one ſinner who reformeth, than for ninety-nine righteous perſons
who need no reformation.
8 Or what woman, who hath ten drachmas (*t*), if ſhe loſe one,
doth not light a lamp, and ſweep the houſe, and ſearch carefully,
9 until ſhe find it? And having found it, doth ſhe not aſſemble her
female friends and neighbours, ſaying, 'Rejoice with me, for I have
10 'found the drachma which I had loſt.' Such joy, I aſſure you, have
the angels of God, when any one ſinner reformeth.
11. *He ſaid alſo*, A certain man had two ſons. And the younger of
them ſaid to his father, 'Father, give me my portion of the eſtate.'
13 And he allotted to them their ſhares. Soon after, the younger ſon
gathered all together, and travelled into a diſtant country, and there

 waſted

(*t*) About 6 s. and 3 d. ſterling.

14 waſted his ſubſtance in riot. When all was ſpent, a great
15 famine came upon that land, and he began to be in want. Then
he applied to one of the inhabitants of that country who ſent him
16 into his fields to keep ſwine. And he was fain to fill his belly
with the huſks on which the ſwine were feeding; for nobody gave
17 him aught. At length, coming to himſelf, he ſaid 'How many
'hirelings hath my father who have all more bread than ſufficeth
18 'them, while I periſh with hunger. I will ariſe and go to my fa-
'ther, and I will ſay unto him, Father, I have ſinned againſt heaven
19 'and thee, and am no longer worthy to be called thy ſon, make me
20 'as one of thy hirelings.' And he aroſe and went to his father.
When he was yet afar off, his father ſaw him, and had compaſſion,
21 and ran, and threw himſelf upon his neck, and kiſſed him. And the
ſon ſaid, 'Father, I have ſinned againſt heaven and thee, and am
22 'no longer worthy to be called thy ſon.' But the father ſaid to his
ſervants, 'Bring hither the principal robe and put it on him, and
23 'put a ring on his finger, and ſhoes on his feet: bring alſo the fatted
24 'calf and kill it, and let us eat and be merry; for this my ſon was
'dead and is alive again; he was loſt and is found.' So they began
to be merry.

25 Now his elder ſon was in the field walking home. And as he drew
26 near the houſe, he heard muſic and dancing He therefore called
27 one of the ſervants and aſked the reaſon of this. He anſwered,
'Thy brother is returned, and thy father hath killed the fatted calf,
28 'becauſe he hath received him in health.' And he was angry and
would not go in; therefore his father came out and entreated him.
29 He anſwering, ſaid to his father, 'Theſe many years I have ſerved
'thee, without diſobeying thy command in any thing; yet thou never
30 'gaveſt me a kid, that I might entertain my friends: but no ſooner
'did this thy ſon return, who hath ſquandered thy living on proſti-
31 'tutes, than thou killedſt for him the fatted calf.' 'Son,' replied the
32 father, 'thou art always with me, and all that I have is thine: it was
'but reaſonable that we ſhould rejoice and be merry; becauſe
'this thy brother was dead and is alive again; he was loſt and is
'found.'

XVI. *HE ſaid likewiſe to his diſciples*, A certain rich man had a ſtew-
2 ard, who was accuſed to him of waſting his eſtate. Having there-
fore called him, he ſaid, 'What is this that I hear of thee? Render an
'account of thy management, for thou ſhalt be ſteward no longer.'
3 And the ſteward ſaid within himſelf, 'What ſhall I do? My maſter
'taketh from me the ſtewardſhip. I cannot dig, and am aſhamed to
4 'beg. I am reſolved what to do, that when I am diſcarded, there may
5 'be ſome who will receive me into their houſes.' Having there-
fore

fore ſent ſeverally for all his maſter's debtors, he aſked one, 'How
6 'much oweſt thou to my maſter?' He anſwered, 'A hundred baths
'of oil (*u*).' 'Take back thy bill,' ſaid the ſteward, 'ſit down direct-
7 'ly, and write one for fifty.' Then he aſked another, 'How much
'oweſt thou?' He anſwered, 'A hundred homers (*x*) of wheat.'
8 'Take back thy bill,' ſaid he, 'and write one for eighty.' The
maſter commended the prudence of the unjuſt ſteward; for the chil-
dren of this world are more prudent in conducting their affairs than
9 the children of light. Therefore I ſay unto you, With the deceitful
mammon procure to yourſelves friends, who, after your diſcharge,
may receive you into the eternal manſions.
10 Whoſo is faithful in little, is faithful alſo in much: and whoſo
11 is unjuſt in little, is unjuſt alſo in much. If therefore ye have not
been honeſt in the deceitful, who will intruſt you with the true
12 riches? And if ye have been unfaithful managers for another, who
13 will give you any thing to manage for yourſelves? A ſervant cannot Mat. 6; 24.
ſerve two maſters; for either he will hate one, and love the other,
or at leaſt will attend one, and neglect the other. Ye cannot
ſerve God and mammon.
14 *When the phariſees, who loved money, heard all theſe things, they*
15 *ridiculed him. But he ſaid unto them*, As for you, ye make your-
ſelves paſs upon men for righteous, but God knoweth your hearts;
for that which is admired by men, is abhorred of God.
16 Ye had the law and the Prophets until the coming of John, ſince Mat. 11; 12.
whoſe time the kingdom of God is announced, and every occupant
17 entereth it by force. But ſooner ſhall heaven and earth periſh, than Mat. 5; 18.
one tittle of the law ſhall fail.
18 Whoever divorceth his wife, and taketh another, committeth Mat. 5; 32.
adultery; and whoever marrieth the divorced woman, committeth Mar. 10; 11.
adultery.
19 There was a certain rich man, that wore purple and fine linen,
20 and feaſted ſplendidly every day. There was alſo a poor man, named
21 Lazarus, covered with ſores, that was laid at his gate; and was
fain to feed on the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: yea,
22 even the dogs came and licked his ſores. It happened that the poor
man died, and was conveyed by angels to Abraham's boſom: the
23 rich man alſo died, and was buried. And in hades, being in tor-
ments, he looked up, and ſaw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in
24 his boſom, and cried, ſaying, 'Have pity on me, father Abraham,
'and ſend Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my
25 'tongue, for I am tormented in this flame.' Abraham anſwered,
'Son, remember that thou, in thy life-time, receiveſt good things,
'and

(*u*) *A bath* thought equal to 7¾ Engliſh gallons. (*x*) *A homer* to 75¼ gallons.

'and Lazarus received evil things; but now, he is in joy, and thou art
26 'in torments. Beſides, there lieth a huge gulph betwixt us and you,
'ſo that they who would paſs hence to you, cannot; neither can
27 'they paſs to us who would come thence.' The other replied, 'I
28 'entreat thee then, father, to ſend him to my father's houſe; for I
'have five brothers, that he may admoniſh them, leſt they alſo come
29 'into this place of torment.' Abraham anſwered, 'They have
30 'Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them.' 'Nay,' ſaid he,
'father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead, they
31 'would reform.' Abraham replied, 'If they hear not Moſes and
'the Prophets; neither will they be perſuaded, though one ſhould
'ariſe from the dead.'

SECTION XI.

Important Inſtructions and Warnings.

XVII. *THEN he ſaid to his diſciples*, It is impoſſible to exclude ſnares
Mat. 18; 7. Mat. 18; 6. Mar. 9; 42. 2 entirely; but woe unto him who inſnareth. It would be more eligible for him to have an upper millſtone faſtened to his neck, and to be caſt into the ſea, than to inſnare any of theſe little ones.

Mat. 18; 21. Eccluſ. 19; 13. 3 Take heed to yourſelves; if thy brother treſpaſs againſt thee, re-
4 buke him; and if he repent, forgive him; and if he treſpaſs againſt thee ſeven times in a day, and ſeven times in a day return [to thee], ſaying, 'I repent,' thou ſhalt forgive him.

Mat. 17; 20. 5 *Then the Apoſtles ſaid to the Lord*, Increaſe our faith. *He anſwered*, If ye had faith, though it were but as a grain of muſtardſeed, ye might ſay to this ſycamine, 'Be extirpated and planted in the ſea,' and it would obey you.

7 Would any of you, who hath a ſervant plowing or feeding cattle, ſay to him, on his return from the field, 'Come immedi-
8 'ately, and place thyſelf at table?' and not rather, 'Make ready my
'ſupper; gird thyſelf, and ſerve me, until I have eaten and drunken;
9 'afterwards thou mayſt eat and drink?' Is he obliged to that ſer-
10 vant for obeying his orders? I ſuppoſe not. In like manner ſay ye, when ye have done all that is commanded you, 'We thy ſer-
'vants have conferred no favour; we have done only what we were
'bound to do.'

11 *NOW, in travelling to Jeruſalem, he paſſed through the confines*
12 *of Samaria and Galilee, and being about to enter a certain village,*
13 *there met him ten lepers, who ſtood at a diſtance, and cried out,*

14 Jeſus, Maſter take pity upon us. *When he ſaw them, he ſaid to*
them, Go, ſhow yourſelves to the prieſts. *And as they went, they* Lev. 14; 2.
15 *were cleanſed. And one of them perceiving that he was healed, turned*
16 *back, glorifying God aloud. Then throwing himſelf proſtrate at the feet*
of Jeſus, he returned him thanks; now this man was a Samaritan.
17 *Jeſus ſaid*, Were not ten cleanſed? Where then are the other nine?
18 Have none returned to give glory to God, except this alien? *And*
he ſaid to him, Ariſe, go thy way, thy faith hath cured thee.
20 *Being queſtioned by the phariſees when the reign of God ſhould com-*
mence, he anſwered, The reign of God is not uſhered in with parade;
21 nor ſhall people ſay, 'Lo here!' or 'Lo yonder!' for behold the reign
of God is within you.
22 *Then he ſaid to his diſciples*, The time will come when ye ſhall
deſire to ſee one of thoſe days of the Son of Man, and ſhall not ſee
23 it. But when they ſay to you, 'Lo here,' or 'Lo yonder,' go not Mat. 24; 23.
24 out to follow them. For as the lightning flaſheth in an inſtant Mar. 13; 21.
from one extremity of the ſky to the other, ſo will the appearance
25 of the Son of Man be in his day. But firſt he muſt ſuffer much,
26 and be rejected by this generation. And as it happened in Noah's Mat. 24; 37.
27 day's, it will alſo happen in the days of the Son of Man. They
ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until
the day that Noah entered the ark, when the deluge came and de-
28 ſtroyed them all. In like manner, as it was in the days of Lot,
they ate, they drank, they bought, they ſold, they planted, they
29 built; but on the day that Lot left Sodom, it rained fire and
30 brimſtone from heaven, which deſtroyed them all. So will it alſo Gen. 19; 24.
be on the day when the Son of Man ſhall appear. On that
31 day let not him who ſhall be on the houſe-top, having his furni-
ture in the houſe, come down to take it away. Let not him who Mat. 10; 39.
32 ſhall be in the field, return home. Remember Lot's wife. Whoſo- & 16; 25.
ever ſhall ſeek to ſave his life, ſhall loſe it; and whoſoever ſhall Mar. 8; 35.
34 throw it away, ſhall preſerve it. I tell you, there will be two men ch. 9; 24. Jo. 12; 25.
that night in one bed; one will be ſeized, and the other will Mat. 24; 40.
35 eſcape. Two women will be grinding together; one will be ſeized,
36 and the other will eſcape. [Two men will be in the field; one will Mat. 24; 28.
37 be ſeized, and the other will eſcape.] *Then they aſked him*, Where,
Maſter? *He anſwered*, Where the body is, the eagles will be aſ-
ſembled.

XVIII. *He alſo ſhewed them, by a parable, that they ought to perſiſt in* 1 Th. 5; 17.
2 *prayer without growing weary.* In a certain city, *ſaid he*, there was
3 a judge, who neither feared God, nor regarded man. And there
was a widow in that city who came to him, ſaying, 'Do me juſtice
4 'on my adverſary.' For ſome time he refuſed: but afterwards he
argued thus with himſelf, 'Although I neither fear God, nor regard

5 'man; yet becauſe this widow importuneth me, I will judge her
6 'cauſe, leſt ſhe come perpetually and plague me.' Mark, *ſaid the*
7 *Lord*, what the unjuſt judge determined. And will not God avenge his
elect, who cry to him day and night? Will he linger in their cauſe?
8 I aſſure you, he will ſuddenly avenge them. Nevertheleſs, when
the Son of Man cometh, will he find this belief in the land?

9 *Then addreſſing ſome who were conceited of themſelves as being righteous,*
10 *and deſpiſed others, he propoſed this example:* Two men went up
11 to the temple to pray; one a phariſee, the other a publican. The
phariſee ſtanding by himſelf, prayed thus: 'O God, I thank thee
'that I am not as other men, extortioners, unjuſt, adulterers, or even
12 'as this publican. I faſt twice a week. I give tithes of all that I
13 'poſſeſs. But the publican ſtanding at a diſtance, and not daring ſo
much as to lift up his eyes to heaven, ſmote upon his breaſt, and
14 cried, 'God be merciful to me a ſinner.' I aſſure you that this man re-
ch. 14; 11. Mat. 23; 12. turned home, more approved than the other; for whoever exalt-
eth himſelf, ſhall be humbled; but whoever humbleth himſelf, ſhall
be exalted.

Mat. 19; 13. Mar. 10; 13. 15 *Then they preſented babes to him, that he might touch them: the diſ-*
16 *ciples obſerving it, rebuked [thoſe who brought] them. But Jeſus*
calling them to him, ſaid, Permit the children to come unto me, and
17 do not forbid them; for ſuch is the kingdom of God. Verily I ſay
unto you, Whoſoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child,
ſhall never enter it.

Mat. 19; 16. Mar. 10; 17. 18 *THEN a certain ruler aſked him, ſaying,* Good teacher, what good
19 ſhall I do to obtain eternal life? *Jeſus anſwered,* Why calleſt thou me
Ex. 20; 12. Deut. 5; 16. 20 good? God alone is good. Thou knoweſt the commandments. Do
not commit adultery; do not commit murder; do not ſteal; do not
21 give a falſe teſtimony; honour thy father and thy mother. *He re-*
plied, All theſe I have obſerved from my childhood. *Hearing this,*
Jeſus ſaid to him, Yet in one thing thou art deficient: ſell all that
thou haſt, and diſtribute to the poor, and thou ſhalt have treaſure
23 in heaven: then come and follow me. *When he heard this, he was*
exceedingly ſorrowful, for he was very rich.

Mat 19; 23. Mar. 10; 23. 24 *Jeſus perceiving that he was very ſorrowful, ſaid,* How difficult
25 will it be for men of opulence to enter the kingdom of God! It is
eaſier for a camel to paſs through a needle's eye, than for a rich
26 man to enter the kingdom of God. *The hearers ſaid,* Who then
27 can be ſaved? *Jeſus anſwered,* Things impoſſible to men, are poſſible
to GOD.

Mat. 19; 27. Mar. 10; 28. 28 *Then Peter ſaid,* Lo! we have forſaken all, and followed thee.
29 *Jeſus anſwered,* Verily I ſay unto you, that there is none who
ſhall have forſaken his houſe, or parents, or brothers, or wife,

30 or children, on account of the kingdom of God; who ſhall not receive manifold more in return in this world, and in the future, eternal life.

31 *THEN Jeſus taking the twelve aſide, ſaid to them*, We are now going to Jeruſalem, where all that the Prophets have written con- Mat. 20; 17. Mar. 10; 32.
32 cerning the Son of Man muſt be accompliſhed. For he ſhall be de-
33 livered to the Gentiles, and ridiculed and inſulted and ſpitted on.
34 And after ſcourging, they will kill him, and he ſhall riſe again the third day. *But they underſtood none of theſe things: this diſcourſe was hidden from them; they did not comprehend its meaning.*

35 *When he came near Jericho, a blind man, who ſat by the way-ſide* Mat. 20; 29.
36 *begging, hearing the crowd paſs by, enquired what was the matter.* Mar. 10; 46.
37 *And being told that Jeſus the Nazarene was paſſing by, he immediately*
39 *cried, ſaying*, Jeſus, Son of David, have pity upon me. *They who went before, charged him to be ſilent; but he cried ſtill the louder*, Son of
40 David, have pity upon me. *Jeſus ſtopped, and commanded them to bring*
41 *the man to him. And when he was nigh, he aſked him, ſaying*, What doſt thou wiſh me to do for thee? *He anſwered*, Maſter, to give me
42 my ſight. *And Jeſus ſaid to him*, Receive thy ſight; thy faith hath
43 cured thee. *Inſtantly he received his ſight, and followed him, glorifying God; and all the people ſaw it, and praiſed God.*

XIX. *When Jeſus had entered, and was paſſing through Jericho, behold*
3 *a man named Zaccheus, a rich man, and chief of the publicans, endeavoured to ſee what ſort of perſon he was, but could not for the preſs,*
4 *being of a low ſtature. Therefore running before, he climbed up into a ſycamore to ſee him, having obſerved that he was going that way.*
5 *When Jeſus came to the place, he looked up, and ſeeing him ſaid*, Zaccheus, make haſte and come down, for to-day I muſt abide at thy
6 houſe. *And he made haſte, and came down, and received him joyfully.*
7 *When the multitude perceived this, they ſaid, murmuring*, He is gone
8 to be entertained by a ſinner. *But Zaccheus preſenting himſelf before Jeſus, ſaid*, Maſter, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and
9 if in aught I have wronged any man, I will reſtore fourfold. *And Jeſus ſaid concerning him*, To-day is ſalvation come to this houſe, in-
10 aſmuch as he alſo is a ſon of Abraham. For the Son of Man is come Mat. 18; 11.
to ſeek and recover that which was loſt.

11 *As the people were attentive he added this parable, becauſe he was*
12 *nigh Jeruſalem, and they fancied the reign of God would immediately commence:* A certain nobleman went abroad to procure for himſelf
13 royalty, and then return; and having called ten of his ſervants, and delivered them ten pounds, he ſaid, 'Improve theſe till I return.'
14 Now his citizens hated him; and ſending an embaſſy after him,
15 proteſted, 'we will not have this man for our king.' When he returned,

veſted

veſted with royal power, he commanded thoſe ſervants to be called to whom he had committed the money, that he might know what
16 every one had gained. Then came the firſt, and ſaid, 'My Lord, thy
17 'pound (*y*) hath gained ten pounds.' He anſwered, 'Well done, good 'ſervant, becauſe thou haſt been faithful in a very ſmall matter,
18 'receive thou the government of ten cities.' And the ſecond who
19 came ſaid, 'My Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds.' He
20 anſwered, 'Be thou too governor of five cities.' Another came, ſaying, 'My Lord, here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in
21 'a napkin; for I was afraid of thee, becauſe thou art a hard maſter; 'thou exacteſt what thou didſt not give, and reapeſt what thou didſt
22 'not ſow.' He anſwered, 'Out of thine own mouth, thou malig- 'nant ſervant, I will condemn thee. Didſt thou know that I am a
23 'hard maſter, exacting what I did not give, and reaping what I did 'not ſow? Why then didſt not thou put my money into the bank, 'that at my return I might have received it with intereſt?' Then
24 he ſaid to his attendants, 'Take the pound from him, and give it to
25 'him who hath the ten pounds.' They anſwered, 'My Lord, he
Mat. 13; 12. & 25; 29. Mar. 4; 25. ch. 8; 18. 26 'hath ten pounds.' [He replied,] 'I tell you that to every one 'who hath, more ſhall be given; but from him who hath not,
27 'even that which he hath ſhall be taken. But as for thoſe mine 'enemies, who would not have me for their king; bring them 'hither, and ſlay them in my preſence.'

SECTION XII.

The Entry into Jeruſalem.

28 *AFTER this diſcourſe Jeſus walked foremoſt, travelling towards*
Mat. 21; 1. Mar. 11; 1. 29 *Jeruſalem. When he approached Bethphage and Bethany, near the mountain called the Mount of Olives, he ſent two of his diſciples,*
30 *ſaying*, Go to yonder village, wherein, as ye enter, ye ſhall find
31 a colt tied on which no man ever rode, looſe him and bring him. If any one aſk why ye looſe him, ye ſhall anſwer, 'Becauſe the maſter
32 'needeth him.' *Accordingly they who received this order, went and*
33 *found every thing as he had told them. As they were looſing the colt,*
34 *the owners ſaid to them*, Why looſe ye the colt? *They anſwered*, The
Jo. 12; 14. 35 Maſter needeth him. *So they brought him to Jeſus, and having*
36 *thrown their mantles upon the colt, ſet Jeſus thereon. As he went,*
37 *the people ſpread their mantles in the way before him. When he was ſo near as the deſcent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the*

(*y*) About 7l. 10s. ſterling.

the diſciples began to praiſe God in loud acclamations, for all the mi-
38 *racles which they had ſeen, ſaying,* 'Bleſſed be the King who cometh
'in the name of the Lord;' peace in heaven, and glory in the higheſt
39 heaven. *Upon this ſome phariſees in the crowd ſaid to him,* Rabbi,
40 rebuke thy diſciples. *He anſwered,* I tell you that if theſe were
ſilent, the ſtones would cry out.

41 *When he came near and beheld the city, he wept over it, ſaying,*
Oh that thou hadſt conſidered, at leaſt in this thy day, the things
which concern thy peace! But now they are hidden from thine
43 eyes: for the days are coming upon thee when thine enemies
will ſurround thee with a rampart, and encloſe thee, and ſhut
44 thee up on every ſide, and will level thee with the ground, and
cruſh thy children in the ruins, and will not leave thee one ſtone ch. 21; 6.
upon another, becauſe thou didſt not conſider the time when thou Mat. 24; 2.
waſt viſited. Mar. 13; 2.

45 *Afterwards he went into the temple, and drove out thence thoſe* Mat. 21; 12.
46 *who ſold and thoſe who bought therein, ſaying to them,* It is written, Mar. 11; 15.
"My houſe is a houſe of prayer, but ye have made it a den of Iſ. 56; 7.
"robbers." Jer. 7. 11.

47 *And he taught daily in the temple, while the chief prieſts and the*
48 *ſcribes, and perſons of principal note, ſought his deſtruction, but could*
not deviſe how to effect it; for all the people heard him with the
greateſt attention.

XX. *One of thoſe days, as he was teaching the people in the temple, and* Mat. 21; 23.
publiſhing the good tidings, the chief prieſts and the ſcribes, with the Mar. 11; 28.
2 *elders, came upon him, ſaying,* Tell us by what authority thou doſt
3 theſe things, or who is he that empowered thee? *He anſwering,*
4 *ſaid unto them,* I alſo have a queſtion to put to you. Tell me
then, Was the title which John had to baptize, from heaven or from
5 men? *But they reaſoned thus with themſelves, If we ſay 'from heaven,'*
6 *he will reply, 'Why then did ye not believe him?' And if we ſay, 'from*
'men,' all the people will ſtone us; for they are perſuaded that John
7 *was a prophet,* They therefore anſwered that they could not tell whence.
8 *Jeſus replied,* Neither tell I you, by what authority I do theſe
things.

9 *Then he ſpake to the people this parable:* A man planted a vine- Mat. 21; 33.
yard, and farmed it out, and having travelled, continued long Mar. 12; 1.
10 abroad. The ſeaſon being come, he ſent a ſervant to the huſband-
men, to receive of the produce of the vineyard; but they beat
11 him, and ſent him back empty. Afterwards he ſent another ſervant,
whom they, having beaten and uſed him ſhamefully, alſo ſent
12 away empty. He afterwards diſpatched a third to them. Him
13 likewiſe they wounded and drove away. Then the proprietor of

the vineyard ſaid, 'What ſhall I do? I will ſend my beloved ſon;
14 'they will ſurely reverence him when they ſee him.' But when the
huſbandmen ſaw him, they reaſoned thus among themſelves, 'This
'is the heir, come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be our
15 'own.' And having thruſt him out of the vineyard, they killed him.
What, therefore, will the proprietor of the vineyard do to them?
16 He will come and deſtroy thoſe huſbandmen, and give the vineyard
to others. *And ſome of his hearers ſaid*, God forbid.

Mat. 21; 42. Pſ. 118; 22. Acts, 4; 11. 1 Pet. 2; 6.
17 *Jeſus, looking on them, ſaid*, What then meaneth that expreſſion of
Scripture, "A ſtone which the builders rejected is made the head of
18 "the corner. Whoſoever ſhall fall upon that ſtone, ſhall be bruiſed;
19 "but on whomſoever it ſhall fall, it will cruſh him to pieces." *At
that time the chief prieſts and the ſcribes, knowing that he had ſpoken
this parable againſt them, would have laid hands on him, but feared the
people.*

Mat. 22; 15. Mar. 12; 13.
20 *And they watched him, and ſet ſpies upon him, inſtructing them to
perſonate conſcientious men, and ſurpriſe him in his words, that they*
21 *might conſign him to the power and authority of the procurator. Theſe
accoſted him with this queſtion*, Rabbi, we know that thou ſpeakeſt
and teacheſt uprightly, and that, without reſpect of perſons, thou
22 faithfully recommendeſt the way of God. Is it lawful for us to pay
23 taxes to Ceſar or not? *He perceiving their ſubtlety, anſwered*, Why
24 would ye inveigle me? Shew me a denarius. Whoſe image and
25 inſcription hath it? *They anſwered*, Ceſar's. *He replied*, Render,
therefore, to Ceſar that which is Ceſar's, and to God that which is
26 God's. *Thus they could not ſurpriſe him in his diſcourſes before the
people; wherefore, admiring his anſwer, they kept ſilence.*

Mat. 22; 23. Mar. 12; 18. Acts, 23; 8. Deut. 25; 5.
27 *Afterwards ſome of the Sadducees who deny a future ſtate, come to*
28 *him with this queſtion:* Rabbi, Moſes hath enjoined in his writings
that a man whoſe brother dieth childleſs outlived by his wife, ſhall
29 marry the widow and raiſe iſſue to his brother. Now there were
ſeven brothers, the firſt of whom having taken a wife, died child-
30 leſs; the ſecond married the widow, and alſo died childleſs; the
third too married her, as did likewiſe the reſt; and all the ſeven died
32 leaving no children. Laſt of all the woman died alſo. To which
of them, therefore, will ſhe be wife at the reſurrection; for ſhe hath
34 been married to all the ſeven? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them*, The
35 people of this world marry and are given in marriage; but among
them who ſhall be honoured to ſhare in the reſurrection and the
other world, there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage:
36 For they cannot die any more; becauſe angel-like they are children
37 of God, being children of the reſurrection. But that the dead are
raiſed, even Moſes hath ſuggeſted, calling the Lord who appeared in
the buſh, the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God

of

38 of Jacob. Now he is not a God of the dead, but of the living;
39 for they are all [though dead to us] alive to him. *Then ſome of the*
40 *ſcribes ſaid to him*, Rabbi, thou haſt ſpoken well. *After that they did not venture to aſk him any more queſtions.*

41 *And he ſaid to them*, Why is it affirmed that the Meſſiah muſt be Mat. 22; 41.
42 a Son of David? Yet David himſelf ſaith in the Book of Pſalms, Mar. 12; 35.
43 "The Lord (z) ſaid to my lord, Sit at my right hand until I make Pſ. 110; 1.
44 "thy foes thy footſtool." As David thus calleth him his lord, how can he be David's ſon?

45 *Then in the audience of all the people he ſaid to his diſciples*, ch. 11; 43.
46 Beware of the ſcribes who love to walk in robes, and affect ſalutations in public places, and the principal ſeats in the ſynagogues, and Mat. 23; 6. Mar. 12; 38.
47 the uppermoſt places at feaſts; who devour the families of widows, and make long prayers for a diſguiſe. Theſe ſhall ſuffer the ſevereſt puniſhment. Mat. 23; 14.

XXI. *As Jeſus was obſerving the rich caſting their gifts into the treaſury*, Mar. 12; 41.
2 *he ſaw an indigent widow throw in two mites. And he ſaid*, I tell you truly that this poor widow hath caſt in more than any of
4 them; for all theſe out of their ſuperfluous ſtore, have thrown into the ſacred cheſt; whereas ſhe hath thrown in all the little ſhe had to ſubſiſt upon.

SECTION XIII.

The laſt Supper.

5 SOME *having remarked that the temple was adorned with beautiful* Mat. 24; 1.
6 *ſtones and preſents, he ſaid*, The time will come when theſe Mar. 13; 1. ch. 19; 44.
things which ye behold, ſhall be ſo razed, that one ſtone will not
7 be left upon another. *Then they aſked him, ſaying*, Rabbi, when Mat. 24; 3.
will theſe things be; and what will be the ſign when they are about Mar. 13; 3.
8 to be accompliſhed? *He anſwered*, Take care that ye be not ſeduced; for many will aſſume my character, ſaying, 'I am the perſon,' and
9 the time approacheth; therefore do not follow them. But when ye ſhall hear of wars and inſurrections, be not terrified; for theſe things muſt firſt happen, but the end will not immediately follow.

10 *He added*, Then will nation riſe againſt nation, and kingdom Mat. 24; 7.
11 againſt kingdom. And there ſhall be great earthquakes in ſundry Mar. 13; 8.
places, and famines, and peſtilences; there ſhall be alſo frightful
12 appearances and great prodigies in the ſky. But before all this ye

(z) Jehovah.

ye ſhall be apprehended and proſecuted, and conſigned to ſyna-
gogues, and impriſoned, and dragged before kings and governors,
13 becauſe of my name: and this will afford ſcope for your teſtimony.
14 Be therefore reſolved not to premeditate what defence ye ſhall make;
15 for I will give you an utterance and wiſdom, which none of your
16 adverſaries ſhall be able to refute or reſiſt. And ye ſhall be betrayed
even by parents and brothers, and kinſmen, and friends; and ſome
17 of you they will put to death. And on my account ye ſhall be
18 hated univerſally. Yet not a hair of your head ſhall be loſt. Save
yourſelves by your perſeverance.

Mat. 24; 15. 20 Now when ye ſhall ſee Jeruſalem inveſted with armies, know
Mar. 13; 14. 21 that the deſolation thereof is nigh. Then let thoſe in Judea flee
to the mountains; let thoſe in the city make their eſcape, and
22 let not thoſe in the country enter the city: for theſe will be
days of vengeance wherein all the denunciations of ſcripture ſhall
23 be accompliſhed. But woe unto the women with child, and unto
them who give ſuck in thoſe days: for there ſhall be great diſtreſs
24 in the land and wrath upon this people. They ſhall fall by the
ſword; they ſhall be carried captive into all nations; and Jeruſalem
ſhall be trodden by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles

Mat. 24: 29. 25 be over. And there ſhall be ſigns in the ſun, and in the moon,
Mar. 13; 24. and in the ſtars; and upon the earth the anguiſh of deſponding na-
Iſ. 13; 10.
Ezek. 32; 7. 26 tions; and roarings in the ſeas and floods; men expiring with
Joel, 2; 10. the fear and apprehenſion of thoſe things which are coming upon
31. & 3; 15. 27 the world; for the powers of heaven ſhall be ſhaken. Then they
Rev. 1; 7. ſhall ſee the Son of Man coming in a cloud with great glory and
28 power. Now when theſe things begin to be fulfilled, look up
and lift up your heads, becauſe your deliverance approacheth.

Mat. 24: 32. 29 *He propoſed to them alſo this compariſon:* Conſider the fig-tree, and
Mar. 13; 28. 30 the other trees. When ye obſerve them ſhooting forth, ye know
31 of yourſelves that the ſummer is nigh. Know ye in like manner,
32 when ye ſhall ſee theſe events, that the reign of God is nigh. Verily
I ſay unto you that this generation ſhall not paſs, until all be accom-
33 pliſhed. Heaven and earth ſhall fail; but my words ſhall not fail.
34 Take heed, therefore, to yourſelves, leſt your hearts be overcharged
with ſurfeiting and drunkenneſs and worldly cares, and that day
35 come upon you unawares: for as a net it ſhall encloſe all the inha-
36 bitants of the earth. Be vigilant, therefore, praying on every occa-
ſion, that ye may be accounted worthy to eſcape all theſe impending
evils, and to ſtand before the Son of Man.

37 *Thus Jeſus taught in the temple by day, but retired at night to*
38 *the mountain called the Mount of Olives. And every morning the*
people reſorted early to the temple to hear him.

XXII. *NOW the feaſt of unleavened bread, called the paſſover, being near,* Mat. 26; 1.
2 *the chief prieſts and the ſcribes ſought how they might kill him; for they* Mar. 14; 1.
3 *feared the people. Then Satan entered into Judas, ſurnamed Iſcariot,* Mat. 26; 14.
4 *who was of the number of the twelve. And he went and concerted with* Mar. 14; 10.
the chief prieſts and officers, how he might deliver Jeſus into their
5 *hands. And they were glad, and agreed to give him a certain ſum;*
6 *which Judas having accepted, watched an opportunity to deliver him up without tumult.*
7 *Now the day of unleavened bread being come, on which the paſſover* Mat. 26; 17.
8 *muſt be ſacrificed, Jeſus ſent Peter and John, ſaying,* Go and prepare Mar. 14; 12.
9 for us the paſſover, that we may eat it. *They aſked him,* Where
10 wilt thou that we prepare it? *He anſwered,* When ye enter the city, ye will meet a man carrying a pitcher of water; follow him into the
11 houſe which he ſhall enter, and ſay to the maſter of the houſe, 'The teacher aſketh thee, Where is the gueſt-chamber, where I
12 may eat the paſſover with my diſciples?' And he will ſhow you a
13 large upper room furniſhed; make ready there. *So they went, and having found every thing as he had told them, prepared the paſſover.*
14 *When the hour was come, he placed himſelf at table with the twelve*
15 *Apoſtles, and ſaid to them,* Much have I longed to eat this paſſover
16 with you, before I ſuffer! for I declare to you, that I will never partake of another, until it be accompliſhed in the kingdom of God.
17 *Then taking a cup, he gave thanks, and ſaid,* Take this, and ſhare
18 it amongſt you: for I aſſure you, that I will not again drink of the
19 product of the vine, until the reign of God be come. *Then he took* Mat. 26; 26.
bread, and having given thanks, broke it, and gave it to them, ſaying, Mar. 14; 22.
This is my body which is given for you. Do this in commemoration 1 Cor. 11; 23.
20 of me. *He likewiſe gave the cup after ſupper, ſaying,* This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is ſhed for you.
21 Mark, however, that the hand of him who betrayeth me, is on the Mat. 26; 21.
22 table with mine. The Son of Man is going away, as hath been Mar. 14; 18.
determined: nevertheleſs, woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed. Jo. 13; 21.
23 *Then they began to enquire among themſelves, which of them it could be that would do this.*
24 *There had been alſo a contention among them, which of them ſhould*
25 *be accounted the greateſt. And he ſaid to them,* The kings of the na- Mat. 20; 25.
tions exerciſe dominion over them, and they who oppreſs them are Mar. 10; 42.
26 ſtyled benefactors. But with you it muſt be otherwiſe: nay, let the greateſt amongſt you be as the ſmalleſt, and him who governeth, as
27 he who ſerveth. For whether is greater; he who is at table, or he who ſerveth? Is not he that is at table? Yet I am amongſt you as
28 one who ſerveth. Ye are they who have continued with me in my
29 trials. And I grant unto you to eat and to drink at my table in my

kingdom (ſeeing my Father hath granted me a kingdom), and to
ſit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Iſrael.
31 *The Lord ſaid alſo*, Simon, Simon, Satan hath requeſted permiſ-
32 ſion to ſift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith
fail not; do thou, therefore, when thou haſt recovered thyſelf, con-
Mat. 26; 34. 33 firm thy brethren. *He anſwered*, Maſter, I am ready to accompany
Mar. 14; 30. 34 thee both to priſon and to death. *Jeſus replied*, I tell thee, Peter,
the cock ſhall not crow to-day, before thou have thrice denied that
thou knoweſt me.
Mat. 10; 9. 35 *Then he ſaid to them*, When I ſent you without purſe, and ſcrip,
36 and ſhoes, did ye want any thing? Nothing, *anſwered they*. But
now, *ſaid he*, let him that hath a purſe take it, and likewiſe his
ſcrip; and let him who hath no ſword, ſell his mantle and buy one;
Iſ. 53; 12. 37 for I tell you that this Scripture, "He was ranked among malefac-
"tors," is now to be accompliſhed in me: for the things relating to
38 me muſt [ſoon] be fulfilled. *They ſaid*, Maſter, here are two ſwords.
39 *He replied*, It is enough. *Then he went out, and repaired, as he was*
wont, to the mount of Olives, and his diſciples followed him.
Mat. 26; 36. 40 *Being arrived there, he ſaid to them*, Pray that ye may not yield
Mar. 14; 32. 41 to temptation. *Then being withdrawn from them about a ſtone's caſt,*
42 *he kneeled down and prayed, ſaying*, Father, if thou wilt, take this cup
away from me; nevertheleſs, not my will, but thine be done.
43 *And there appeared to him a meſſenger from heaven ſtrengthening him.*
44 *And being in an agony of grief, he prayed the more fervently, and his*
45 *ſweat fell like clotted blood to the ground. Having ariſen from prayer,*
and returned to his diſciples, he found them ſleeping, oppreſſed with
46 *grief, and ſaid to them*, Why do ye ſleep? Ariſe and pray, leſt the
trial overcome you.
Mat. 26; 47. 47 *Before he had done ſpeaking, he ſaw a multitude, and he who was*
Mar. 14; 43. *called Judas, one of the twelve, walked before them, and came up to*
Jo. 18; 3. 48 *Jeſus to kiſs him. Jeſus ſaid to him*, Judas, betrayeſt thou the Son
49 of Man with a kiſs? *Now thoſe who were with him, foreſeeing what*
would happen, ſaid to him, Maſter, ſhall we ſtrike with the ſword?
50 *And one of them ſtruck the ſervant of the high prieſt, and cut off his*
51 *right ear. Jeſus ſaid*, Let this ſuffice; *and touching his ear, he healed*
52 *him. Then Jeſus ſaid to the chief prieſts, and the officers of the temple-*
guard, and the elders who were come to apprehend him, Do ye come
53 with ſwords and clubs, as in purſuit of a robber? While I was daily
with you in the temple, ye did not attempt to arreſt me. But this is
your hour, and the power of darkneſs.

SECTION XIV.

The Crucifixion.

54 *THEN they ſeized him and led him away to the high prieſt's houſe.* Mat. 26; 57.
55 *And Peter followed at a diſtance. When they had kindled a fire* Mar. 14; 53.
in the middle of the court, and were ſitting round it, Peter ſat down Jo. 18; 13, 24.
56 *among them. And a maid-ſervant having obſerved him ſitting by the* Mat. 26; 69.
fire, and viewed him attentively, ſaid, This man alſo was with him. Mar. 14; 66.
57 *But he diſowned him, ſaying,* Woman, I know him not. *A little* Jo. 18; 16. and 25.
while after, another ſeeing him, ſaid, Thou alſo art one of them.
59 *Peter anſwered,* Man, I am not. *About an hour after, another averred*
the ſame thing, ſaying, This man was ſurely with him, for he is a
60 Galilean. *Peter anſwered,* Man, I know nothing of this matter.
61 *And juſt as he ſpake the word, the cock crew. Then the Lord turning,*
looked upon Peter, and Peter called to mind the word which the Lord
had ſaid unto him, "Before the cock crow, thou wilt diſown me thrice."
62 *And Peter went out and wept bitterly.*
63 *Meantime, they who had Jeſus in charge, mocked and beat him;*
64 *and having blindfolded him, ſtruck him on the face, and aſked him,*
65 *ſaying,* Divine who it is that ſmote thee. *And many other abuſive*
things they ſaid againſt him.
66 *As ſoon as it was day, the national ſenate, with the chief prieſts* Mat. 27; 1.
and ſcribes, were aſſembled, who having cauſed him to be brought into
67 *their council-chamber, ſaid to him,* If thou be the Meſſiah, tell us. *He*
68 *anſwered,* If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I put a queſtion,
69 ye will neither anſwer me, nor acquit me. Hereafter the Son of
70 Man ſhall be ſeated at the right hand of Almighty God. *They all*
replied, Thou art then the Son of God? *He anſwered,* Ye ſay the
71 truth. *Then they cried,* What further need have we of evidence?
We have heard enough ourſelves from his own mouth.

XXIII. *AND the aſſembly broke up, and conducted Jeſus to Pilate.*
2 *And they accuſed him, ſaying,* We found this man perverting the Mat. 27; 11.
nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Ceſar, calling himſelf Mar. 15; 2.
3 Meſſiah the King. *Then Pilate aſking him, ſaid,* Thou art the King
4 of the Jews? *He anſwered,* Thou ſayeſt right. *Pilate ſaid to the*
chief prieſts and the multitude, I find nothing criminal in this man.
5 *But they became more vehement, adding,* He raiſeth ſedition among
the people, by the doctrine which he ſpreadeth through all Judea,
6 from Galilee, where he began, to this place. *When Pilate heard them*
7 *mention Galilee, he aſked whether the man were a Galilean. And find-*
ing

ing that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod who was also then at Jerusalem.

8 *And Herod was very glad to see Jesus: it was what he had long*
desired; having heard much of him, and hoping to see him perform
9 *some miracle. He therefore asked him many questions, but Jesus re-*
10 *turned him no answer. Yet the chief priests and the scribes who were*
11 *present, accused him with eagerness. But Herod and his military train*
despised him; and having in derision arrayed him in a shining robe, re-
12 *manded him to Pilate. On that day Pilate and Herod became friends;*
for before they had been at enmity.

13 *Pilate having convened the chief priests, the magistrates, and the*
14 *people, said to them,* Ye have brought this man before me, as one
who exciteth the people to revolt; yet having examined him in your
Jo. 18; 38. and 19; 4. presence, I have not found him guilty of any of those crimes whereof
15 ye accuse him. Neither hath Herod; for I referred you to him.
Mat. 27; 21. 16 Be assured, then, that he hath done nothing to deserve death. I will
Mar. 15; 12. 17 therefore chastise him, and release him. *For it was necessary that he*
18 *should release one to them at the festival. Then all cried out together,*
19 Away with this man, and release to us Barabbas. *Now Barabbas*
had been imprisoned for raising sedition in the city, and for murder.
20 *Pilate, willing to release Jesus, again expostulated. But they cried,*
22 *saying,* Crucify, crucify him. *A third time he repeated,* Why? what
evil hath this man done? I do not find him guilty of any capital
23 crime; I will therefore chastise him, and release him. *But they*
persisted, demanding, with much clamour, that he might be crucified.
24 *At last their clamours, and those of the chief priests, prevailed: and*
25 *Pilate pronounced sentence that it should be as they desired. Accord-*
ingly he released to them a man who had been imprisoned for sedition
and murder, whom they required, and gave up Jesus to their will.

Mat. 27; 32. Mar. 15; 21. 26 *As they led him away, they laid hold of one Simon a Cyrenian*
coming from the country, and laid the cross on him, that he might
27 *bear it after Jesus. And a great multitude followed him, among*
28 *whom were many women who lamented and bewailed him. But Jesus*
turning to them, said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me,
29 but weep for yourselves, and for your children: for the days are
coming wherein they shall say, 'Happy the barren, the wombs
Is. 2; 19. Hos. 10; 8. Rev. 6; 16. 30 'which never bare, and the breasts which never gave suck:' then
they shall cry to the mountains, 'Fall on us,' and to the hills,
31 'Cover us:' for if it fare thus with the green tree, how shall it
32 fare with the dry? *And two malefactors were also led with him to*
execution.

Mat. 27; 35. Jo. 19; 18. 33 *When they were come to the place called Calvary, they there nailed*
him to the cross, and the malefactors also, one at his right hand, the
34 *other at his left. And Jesus said,* Father, forgive them, for they

35 know not what they do. *And they parted his garments by lot. While* Mat. 15; 24.
the people ſtood gazing, even their rulers joined them in ridiculing him,
and ſaying, This man ſaved others; let him ſave himſelf, if he be
36 the Meſſiah, the elect of God. *The ſoldiers likewiſe mocked him,*
37 *coming and offering him vinegar, and ſaying*, If thou be the King of
38 the Jews, ſave thyſelf. *There was alſo an inſcription over his head,*
in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE
JEWS.
39 *Now one of the malefactors, who ſuffered with him, reviled him,*
40 *ſaying*, If thou be the Meſſiah, ſave thyſelf and us. *The other re-*
buking him, anſwered, Haſt thou no fear of God, thou who art un-
41 dergoing the ſame puniſhment? And we indeed juſtly; for we re-
ceive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing
42 amiſs. *And he ſaid to Jeſus*, Remember me, Lord, when thou
43 comeſt to thy kingdom. *Jeſus anſwered*, Verily I ſay unto thee, to-
day thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe.
44 *And about the ſixth hour there was darkneſs over all the land,*
45 *which laſted till the ninth. The ſun was darkened, and the veil of*
46 *the temple was rent in the midſt. And Jeſus ſaid with a loud voice*,
Father, into thy hands I commit my ſpirit; *and having thus ſaid,* Pſ. 31; 5.
47 *expired. Then the centurion obſerving what had happened, gave glory*
48 *to God, ſaying*, Aſſuredly this was a righteous man. *Nay, all the*
people who were preſent at this ſpectacle, and ſaw what paſſed, returned,
49 *beating their breaſts. And all his acquaintance, and the women who*
had followed him from Galilee, ſtanding at a diſtance, beheld theſe
things.

SECTION XV.

The Reſurrection.

50 *NOW from Arimathea, a city of Judea, there was a ſenator* Mat. 27; 57.
named Joſeph, a good and juſt man, who had not concurred in the Mar 15; 42.
reſolutions and proceedings of the reſt, and who himſelf alſo expected Jo. 19; 38.
52 *the reign of God. This man went to Pilate, and begged the body of*
53 *Jeſus. And having taken it down, he wrapped it in linen, and laid it*
54 *in a tomb cut in ſtone, wherein no man had ever been depoſited. Now*
that day was the preparation (a), and the Sabbath (b) approached.

 And

(a) Friday. (b) Saturday.

55 *And the women who had accompanied Jeſus from Galilee, followed Jo-*
56 *ſeph, and obſerved the monument, and how the body was laid. When they returned, they provided ſpices and ointments, and then reſted the Sabbath (c) according to the commandment.*

Mat. 28; 1. Mar. 16; 1. Jo. 20; 1. XXIV. *But the firſt day of the week (d), they went by day-break, with ſome*
2 *others to the tomb, carrying the ſpices which they had provided; and*
3 *found the ſtone rolled away from the monument; and having entered,*
4 *they found not the body of the Lord Jeſus. While they were in perplexity on this account, behold two men ſtood by them, in robes of a*
5 *dazzling brightneſs. The women being affrighted, and fixing their eyes on the ground, theſe ſaid to them,* Why ſeek ye the living among
ch. 9; 22. Mat. 16; 21. & 17; 22. Mar. 9; 31. 6 the dead? He is not here, but is riſen; remember how he ſpake to
7 you, before he left Galilee, ſaying, "The Son of Man muſt be de-
8 "livered into the hands of ſinners, and be crucified, and the third "day riſe again." *Then they remembered his words.*

Mat. 28; 8. 9 *On their return from the monument, they reported the whole matter*
10 *to the eleven, and to all the reſt. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women with them,*
11 *who told theſe things to the apoſtles: but their account appeared to them*
12 *as idle tales; they gave them no credit. Peter, however, aroſe, and ran to the monument; and ſtooping down, ſaw nothing there but the linen lying. And he went away, muſing with aſtoniſhment on what had happened.*

Mar. 16; 12. 13 *The ſame day, as two of them were travelling to a village named*
14 *Emmaus, ſixty furlongs from Jeruſalem, they converſed together about*
15 *all theſe events. While they were converſing and reaſoning, Jeſus him-*
16 *ſelf joined them, and went along with them. But their eyes were ſo*
17 *affected, that they did not know him. And he ſaid to them,* What ſubjects are theſe about which ye confer together? and why are ye de-
18 jected? *And one of them, named Cleopas, anſwered,* Art thou the only ſtranger in Jeruſalem, who is unacquainted with the things
19 which have happened there ſo lately? What things? *ſaid he. They anſwered,* Concerning Jeſus the Nazarene, who was a Prophet, pow-
20 erful in word and deed, before God and all the people; how our chief prieſts and magiſtrates have delivered him to be condemned to
21 death, and have crucified him. As for us, we truſted that it had been he who ſhould have redeemed Iſrael. Beſide all this, to-day
22 being the third day ſince theſe things happened, ſome women of our company have aſtoniſhed us; for having gone early to the monu-
23 ment, and not found his body, they came and told us that they had ſeen

(c) Saturday. (d) Sunday.

24 ſeen a viſion of angels, who ſaid that he is alive. Whereupon
ſome of our men went to the monument, and found matters exactly
as the women had related; but him they ſaw not.
25 *Then he ſaid to them*, O thoughtleſs men, and backward to be-
26 lieve things which have been all predicted by the Prophets! Ought
27 not the Meſſiah thus to ſuffer, and ſo to enter into his glory? *Then
beginning with Moſes, and proceeding through all the Prophets, he ex-*
28 *plained to them all the paſſages relating to himſelf. When they came
near the village, whither they were travelling, he ſeemed as intending*
29 *to go farther. But they conſtrained him, ſaying*, Abide with us; for
it groweth late, and the day is far ſpent. *And he went in to abide with*
30 *them. While they were at table together, he took the loaf, and bleſſed*
31 *and broke it, and diſtributed to them. Then their eyes were opened, and*
32 *they knew him; and he diſappeared. And they ſaid one to another*,
Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us on the
road, and expounded to us the Scriptutes?
33 *Immediately they aroſe, and returned to Jeruſalem, where they found*
34 *the eleven, and the reſt of their company, aſſembled, who ſaid*, The
35 Maſter is actually riſen, and hath appeared unto Simon. *Theſe alſo
recounted what had happened on the road, and how he was diſcovered to
them in breaking the loaf.*
36 *While they diſcourſed in this manner, Jeſus ſtood in the midſt of* Mar. 16; 14.
37 *them, and ſaid*, Peace be unto you. *But they were amazed and af-* Jo. 20; 19.
38 *frighted, imagining that they ſaw a ſpirit. And he ſaid to them*,
Why are ye alarmed? And wherefore do ſuſpicions ariſe in your
39 hearts? Behold my hands and my feet; it is I myſelf; handle me
and be convinced; for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as ye ſee me
40 have. *Saying this, he ſhowed them his hands and his feet. While
yet they believed not, for joy and amazement, he ſaid to them*, Have ye
42 here any thing to eat? *And they gave him a piece of broiled fiſh, and*
43 *of a honey-comb, which he took and ate in their preſence. And he ſaid
to them*, This is what I told you while I remained with you, that
all the things which are written concerning me in the law of Moſes,
45 and the Prophets, and the Pſalms, muſt be accompliſhed. *Then he*
46 *opened their minds, that they might underſtand the Scriptures, and ſaid to
them*, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Meſſiah to ſuffer,
47 and to riſe from the dead the third day; and that reformation, and
the remiſſion of ſins ſhould be proclaimed in his name amongſt all
48 nations, beginning at Jeruſalem. Now ye are witneſſes of theſe Acts, 1; 8.
49 things; and behold I ſend you that which my father hath promiſed; Jo. 15; 26.
but continue ye in the city of Jeruſalem, until ye be inveſted with Acts, 1; 4.
power from on high.

He

50 *He then led them out as far as Bethany, and lifted up his hands and*
Mar. 16; 19. 51 *bleſſed them. And while he was bleſſing them, he was parted from*
Acts, 1; 9. 52 *them, and carried up into heaven. And having worſhipped him,*
53 *they returned to Jeruſalem with great joy; and were conſtantly in the temple, praiſing and bleſſing God. Amen.*

PREFACE

TO

JOHN's GOSPEL.

THAT the Apoſtle John, a fiſherman of Bethſaida in Galilee, the beloved diſciple, the younger brother of James called the greater or elder (there being two Apoſtles of the name) and ſon of Zebedee by Salome (*a*) his wife, one of the three moſt favoured Apoſtles, and who, with his brother James, on account of their zeal in their Maſter's ſervice, were honoured with the title Boanerges, or *Sons of Thunder*, was, in the order of time, the laſt of the Evangeliſts, is manifeſt from the uniform voice of Chriſtian antiquity. There are evident references to this Goſpel, though without naming the author, in ſome Epiſtles of Ignatius, the authenticity of which is ſtrenuouſly maintained by Biſhop Pearſon, and other critics of name.

§ 2. THE preciſe time when this Goſpel was written has not been aſcertained. The moſt probable opinion ſeems to be, that it was after John's return from exile in the iſle of Patmos, whither, as we learn from himſelf, he had been baniſhed *for the word of God and teſtimony of Jeſus (b)*. This probably happened in the perſecution under the emperor Domitian. It was in that iſland where God made thoſe revelations to him, which were collected by him into a book thence called the *Apocalypſe* or Revelation. The laſt of his works is thought to have been his Goſpel, which the entreaties of the Chriſtian people, and paſtors of Epheſus, and of other parts of Aſia Minor, where he had his reſidence in the latter part of his life, prevailed on him to undertake. If ſo, it muſt have been towards the cloſe of the firſt century when this Goſpel firſt appeared in the church, and it was in the beginning of the ſecond when the above-mentioned Ignatius wrote his Epiſtles. There are alſo in Juſtin Martyr, both references to this Goſpel, and quotations

(*a*) Compare Matth. xxvii. 55. with Mar. xv. 40 (*b*) Rev. i. 9.

from it, though without naming the author. Tatian took notice of this Evangeliſt by name, and uſed his Goſpel along with the reſt in compoſing his Diateſſaron. I need ſcarcely mention the notice that is taken of it in the Epiſtle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, or by Ireneus, who names all the Evangeliſts, ſpecifying ſomething peculiar to every one of them whereby he may be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt. I might add Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the whole current of ſucceeding eccleſiaſtical writers.

§ 3. THE account which Ireneus gives of the occaſion of writing this Goſpel, is as follows (*c*): "John, deſirous to extirpate the errors ſown in the minds of "men by Cerinthus, and ſometime before by thoſe called Nicolaitans, publiſhed "his Goſpel, wherein he acquaints us that there is one God who made all things "by his word; and not, as they ſay, one who is the Creator of the world, and "another who is the Father of the Lord; one the Son of the Creator, and another "the Chriſt from the ſuperceleſtial abodes, who deſcended upon Jeſus, the Son of "the Creator, but remained impaſſible, and afterwards flew back into his own ple-"roma or fulneſs."——Again, "This diſciple, therefore, willing at once to cut "off theſe errors, and eſtabliſh a rule of truth in the church, declares that there is "one God Almighty who, by his word, made all things viſible and inviſible; and "that, by the ſame word by which God finiſhed the work of creation, he beſtowed "ſalvation upon men who inhabit the creation. With this doctrine he uſhers in "his Goſpel, *In the beginning was the word*," &c. This teſtimony is of great antiquity, having been given in leſs than a century after the publication of the Goſpel. As Ireneus, however, names no authority, and quotes no preceding writer in ſupport of what he has advanced in relation to the deſign of the Evangeliſt, it can only be conſidered by us as on the footing of ancient tradition.

§ 4. CLEMENT of Alexandria, who wrote not long after Ireneus, has, as we learn from Euſebius (*d*), added ſome particulars, as what in his opinion, together with the entreaties of the Aſiatic churches, contributed not a little to induce John to compoſe his Goſpel. The firſt he mentions is, that the Evangeliſts who had preceded him, had taken little notice of our Lord's teaching and actions ſoon after the commencement of his miniſtry, and before the impriſonment of John the Baptiſt. One conſideration therefore, which induced him, though late, to publiſh a Goſpel, was to ſupply what ſeemed to have been omitted by thoſe who had gone before him. For this reaſon he avoided, as much as poſſible, recurring to thoſe paſſages of our Lord's hiſtory of which the preceding Evangeliſts had given an account. There was no occaſion, therefore, for him to give the genealogy of our Saviour's fleſh, as the hiſtorian expreſſes it (*e*), which had been done by Matthew and

(*c*) Adverſ. Hæreſ. lib. iii. cap. 11.

(*d*) Lib. iii. cap. 24.

(*e*) Lib. iii. cap. 24. Εικοτως δε την μεν της σαρκος του σωτηρος ἡμων γενεαλογιαν ὁτι Ματθαιω και Λουκα προγραφησαι, αποσιωπησαι τον Ἰωαννην.

and Luke before him. The ſame Euſebius ſays in another place *(f)*, quoting Clement, "John, who is the laſt of the Evangeliſts, having ſeen that in the three former Goſpels corporeal things had been explained, and being urged by his acquaintance, and inſpired of God, compoſed a ſpiritual Goſpel." Thus it appears to have been a very early tradition in the church that this Goſpel was compoſed not only to ſupply what had not been fully communicated in the former Goſpels, but alſo to ſerve for refuting the errors of Cerinthus and the Gnoſtics.

§ 5. YET in the time of Epiphanius, about the middle of the fourth century, an opinion, much the reverſe of the former, was maintained by a few ſectaries whom he calls *Alogians* (*g*), becauſe they rejected the Logos, that is, *the word*. Their opinion was, that Cerinthus himſelf was the author of this Goſpel, an opinion, as Epiphanius clearly ſhows, quite improbable in itſelf, and unſupported by evidence; improbable in itſelf, becauſe the words employed by the Evangeliſt, ſo far from confirming, contradict the ſentiments of the Hereſiarch, unſupported by evidence, becauſe there is nothing to counterbalance the contrary evidence above mentioned, the ancient tradition and uniform teſtimony, both of the friends and of the foes of Chriſtianity, who had all concurred in affirming that this Goſpel was written by John. In all the controverſies maintained with Celſus, with Porphyry, and with the emperor Julian, who ſtrained every nerve to undermine the authority of the Goſpels, they never thought of controverting that they were written by thoſe whoſe names they bear. So clear was this point accounted for ages even by the moſt acute adverſaries of the Chriſtian name.

§ 6. IT deſerves our particular attention that this Goſpel carries in its boſom ſtrong internal evidences of the truth of ſome of thoſe accounts which have been tranſmitted to us from the primitive ages. At the ſame time that it bears marks more ſignal than any of them, that it is the work of an illiterate Jew; the whole ſtrain of the writing ſhows that it muſt have been publiſhed at a time, and in a country the people whereof in general knew very little of the Jewiſh rites and manners. Thus, thoſe who in the other Goſpels are called ſimply the people or the multitude, are here denominated the Jews, a method which would not be natural in their own land, or even in the neighbourhood, where the nation itſelf, and its peculiarities, were perfectly well known. As it was cuſtomary in the Eaſt, both with Jews and others, to uſe proper names independently ſignificant, which, when they went abroad, were tranſlated into the language of the country, this author, that there might be no miſtake of the perſons meant, was careful, when the Greek name had any currency, to mention both names, Syriac and Greek. Thus *Cephas*, *which*

(*f*) Lib. iv. cap. 14. Τον μεν τοι Ιωαννην ισχατον συνιδοντα ὁτι τα σωματικα εν τοις ευαγγελιοις δεδηλωται, προτραπεντα ὑπο των γνωριμων, πνευματι θεοφορηθεντα, πνευματικον ποιησαι ευαγγελιον.—τοσαυτα ὁ Κλημης.

(*g*) Hær. 51. Επει αν του λογου η δεχονται, τον παρα Ιωαννη κεκηρυγμενον, αλογοι κληθησονται. This ancient controvertiſt does not diſdain the humble aid of a pun. Λογος means *reaſon* as well as *word*; αλογοι *unreaſonable*, or *againſt the word*.

which denoteth the ſame as Peter (b); Thomas, that is Didymus (i). The ſame may be ſaid of ſome titles in current uſe, *rabbi, which ſignifieth doctor (k), meſſiah, a term equivalent to Chriſt (l).* In like manner when there is occaſion to mention any of the religious ceremonies uſed in Judea, as their purifications or their feſtivals, it is almoſt invariably ſignified that the ceremony or cuſtom ſpoken of is Jewiſh. Thus the water-pots are ſaid to be placed for the Jewiſh rites of cleanſing (*m*), κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιυδαιων. The paſſover is once and again (*n*) denominated the *Jewiſh paſſover*, ὁ πασχα των Ιυδαιων, a phraſe uſed only by this Evangeliſt; and even any other religious feaſt is called (*o*) by him ἑορτη των Ιυδαιων, a Jewiſh feſtival. This ſtyle runs through the whole. The writer every where ſpeaks as to people who knew little or nothing about the Jews. Thus, in the converſation between our Lord and the woman of Samaria, the hiſtorian interrupts his narrative by inſerting a clauſe to account to the Aſiatic Gentile readers for that ſtrange queſtion put by the woman (*p*), *How is it that thou, who art a Jew, aſkeſt drink of me who am a Samaritan?* The clauſe inſerted for explanation is, *(for the Jews have no friendly intercourſe with the Samaritans.)* Again, for the information of the ſame readers, after acquainting us that the Galileans had ſeen our Lord's miracles, at Jeruſalem during the feſtival, he adds (*q*), *for they likewiſe attended the feſtival.* Neither of theſe explanatory clauſes would ever have been thought of in Paleſtine, or perhaps even in Syria, where the enmity betwixt the Jews and the Samaritans, and the connection of Galilee with Judea, were better known.

§ 7. It may be objected againſt the uſe I make of this obſervation, that as Mark and Luke are thought not to have publiſhed their Goſpels in Paleſtine, it might have been expected that they alſo ſhould have adopted the ſame manner. This in part I admit. I have accordingly pointed out (*r*) a few examples of a ſimilar nature in the Goſpel by Mark. And as to the Evangeliſt Luke, if his Goſpel was, as I have ſuppoſed (*s*), publiſhed at Antioch, or in any part of Syria, there was not the ſame occaſion. But, in anſwer to the objection, it may be further obſerved, that thoſe publiſhed ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion, in whatever part of the world it was, were moſtly for the uſe of converts from Judaiſm, with whom the church, in the beginning, chiefly abounded. But towards the end of the firſt century, the reception of this doctrine, particularly in Greece, Aſia Minor, and thoſe places which had been moſt favoured with the teaching of Paul, became much more general among the Gentiles, who knew little or nothing of Jewiſh ceremonies. That the writer of this Goſpel had ſuch diſciples chiefly in view, is very plain to every reader of diſcernment.

§ 8. Though ſimplicity of manner is common to all our Lord's hiſtorians, there are evident differences in the ſimplicity of one compared with that of another.

(*b*) John, i. 43. (*i*) chap. xi. 16. (*k*) chap. i. 38. (*l*) i. 41.
(*m*) chap. ii. 6. (*n*) chap. ii. 13. vi. 4. xi. 55. (*o*) chap. v. 1. vii. 2. (*p*) chap. iv. 9.
(*q*) 45. (*r*) Preface to Mark, § 5. (*s*) Preface to Luke, § 8.

One thing very remarkable in John's ſtyle, is an attempt to impreſs important truths more ſtrongly on the minds of the readers, by employing, in the expreſſion of them, both an affirmative propoſition, and a negative. Thus (*t*): *All things were made by it* (the word), *and without it not a ſingle creature was made. He acknowledged and denied not, but acknowledged* (*u*). Pleonaſms are very frequent in this Goſpel (*v*): *This man came as a witneſs to teſtify concerning the light:* tautologies alſo, and repetitions. Thus it follows (*x*): *He was not the light, but came to teſtify concerning the light.* Again (*y*): *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. This was in the beginning with God.* See alſo the verſes marked in the margin (*z*).

§ 9. HEBRAISMS are to be found in all the Evangeliſts; though it may be remarked, that ſome abound more with one ſort of Hebraiſm, and others with another. A Hebrew idiom, very frequent with this writer, is the repetition or introduction of the perſonal pronoun in caſes wherein it is perfectly redundant. Thus (*a*): Εφ' ον αν ιδης το πνευμα καταβαινον και μενον επ' αυτον, literally, *On whomſoever thou ſhalt ſee the Spirit deſcending, and remaining upon him.* And (*b*), Ου εγω ουκ ειμι αξιος ινα λυσω αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος. Here both the pronouns ου and αυτου are employed in relation to the ſame perſon, an idiom which it is hardly poſſible to expreſs intelligibly in a modern language. As to other particularities in this writer, I ſhall only obſerve, that the conjunction και is not ſo frequently uſed by John for coupling ſentences, as by the reſt. The introduction or any incident with the phraſe και εγενετο, generally rendered in the common tranſlation, *and it came to paſs;* in which the verb is uſed impersonally, though common in the other Goſpels, never occurs in this.

§ 10. THE introduction of either facts or obſervations, by the adverb ιδε, *behold*, is much rarer in this Goſpel than in the reſt. But in the change (or, as rhetoricians term it, enallagé) of the tenſes, ſo frequent with the Hebrews, John abounds more than any other of our Lord's biographers. He is peculiar in the application of ſome names; as of ο λογος, *the word*, and ο μονογενης, *the only-begotten*, to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and of ο παρακλητος, *the monitor*, or, as ſome render it, *the advocate*, and others, *the comforter*, to the Holy Spirit. He is peculiar alſo in ſome modes of expreſſion, which, though inconſiderable in themſelves, it may not be improper to ſuggeſt in paſſing. Such is his reduplication of the affirmative adverb Αμην; for he always ſays, Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν, *Verily verily I ſay unto you.* It is never uſed but ſingly by the reſt. Upon the whole, John's ſtyle is thought to be more idiomatical, and leſs conformable to the ſyntactic order than that of any other writer in the New Teſtament. There is none whoſe manner more beſpeaks an author deſtitute of the advantages which reſult from letters and education.

(*t*) John, i. 3. (*u*) 20. (*v*) 7. (*x*) 8. (*y*) 1, 2.
(*z*) John i. 15. 26. 27. 30. 31. 33. (*a*) 33. (*b*) 27.

§ 11. IT is manifeſtly not without deſign that he commonly paſſes over thoſe paſſages of our Lord's hiſtory and teaching, which had been treated at large by the other Evangeliſts, or, if he touches them at all, he touches them but ſlightly, whilſt he records many miracles which had been overlooked by the reſt, and expatiates on the ſublime doctrines of the pre-exiſtence, the divinity, and the incarnation of the Word, the great ends of his miſſion, and the bleſſings of his purchaſe. This hiſtory of Jeſus may be truly ſaid to interfere leſs with the reſt than theſe do with one another: in conſequence of which, if its teſtimony cannot often be pleaded in confirmation of theirs, neither is it liable to be urged in contradiction. It is remarkable alſo, that though this Evangeliſt appears, more than any of them, to excel in that artleſs ſimplicity, which is ſcarcely compatible with the ſubtlety of diſputation, we have, in his work, a fuller diſplay of the evidences of our religion, on the footing on which it then ſtood, than in all the reſt put together.

§ 12. HERE we have alſo the true ſources of Chriſtian conſolation under perſecution, and the ſtrongeſt motives to faith, patience, conſtancy, and mutual love, in every ſituation wherein Providence may place us. From the incidents here related, we may learn many excellent leſſons of modeſty, humanity humility, and kind attention to the concerns of others. Nor does any one of thoſe incidents appear to be more fraught with inſtruction, than the charge of his mother, which our bleſſed Lord, at that critical time when he hung in agony upon the croſs, conſigned to his beloved diſciple (*c*). Though the paſſage is very brief and deſtitute of all artful colouring, nothing can impreſs more ſtrongly, on the feeling heart, his reſpectful tenderneſs for a worthy parent, and his unalterable affection for a faithful friend. Upon the whole, the language employed in conveying the ſentiments, is no more than the repoſitory, the caſe. Let not its holineſs diſcourage any one from examining its invaluable contents. The treaſure itſelf is heavenly even the unſearchable riches of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle obſerves (*d*), to be committed *to earthen veſſels, that the excellency of the power may*, to the conviction of all the ſoberminded, *be of God, and not of men.*

§ 13. THE Apoſtle John, by the concurrent teſtimony of all Chriſtian antiquity, after ſuffering perſecution for the cauſe of Chriſt, lived to a very great age, and having ſurvived all the other Apoſtles, died a natural death at Epheſus in Aſia Minor, in the reign of the emperor Trajan.

2

(*c*) John, xix. 25, &c. (*d*) 2 Cor. iv. 7.

CONTENTS.

JOHN's GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

The Incarnation.

CH. I.

THE pre-exiſtence, divinity, and creative exertion of the Word :—the light of the World :—the end of John's miſſion :—the reception of the Word among God's ancient people :—the Word incarnate, the interpreter of God, the fountain of grace and truth to men, viſits the earth :—the Baptiſt's teſtimony concerning himſelf :—concerning the Meſſiah whom God had indicated to him by a viſible token :—two of John's diſciples, induced by their Maſter's teſtimony, follow Jeſus :—others alſo called by Jeſus. *Page* 451

SECTION II.

The Entrance on the Miniſtry.

CH. II. III.

Jeſus turns water into wine at a marriage in Cana ;—goes to Jeruſalem ;—drives the traffickers out of the temple ;—ſilences thoſe who queſtioned his authority ;—makes many converts, but not all worthy of confidence ;—is viſited ſecretly by Nicodemus a magiſtrate, with whom he converſes on regeneration, faith, and fortitude in the cauſe of truth :—Jeſus retires into the country ;—employs his diſciples in baptizing :—this is reported to John,—who gives his teſtimony of Jeſus, exalting his miſſion and perſonal dignity much above his own. 453

SECTION III.

The Journey to Galilee.

CH. IV.

Jeſus, near Sychar of Samaria, enters into converſation with a Samaritan woman ;—diſcovers himſelf to her to be the Meſſiah :—the diſciples, who had gone into the city to buy food, are ſurpriſed to find them converſing together :—he acquaints his diſciples, that to do the work for which he was ſent, was to him as food ;—goes into the city ;—ſtays two days, making many converts ;—returns to Galilee ;—heals the courtier's ſon who lay ſick at Capernaum. 456

SECTION IV.

The Cure at Bethesda.

CH. V.

The ſupernatural cures wrought at Bethesda by the agitation of the water ;—a diſeaſed man who lay there waiting ſuch a cure, healed on the Sabbath by Jeſus, who commanded him to carry home his couch.—Hence

Hence ſome altercation of the Jews,—firſt with the man,—afterwards with Jeſus:—Jeſus alleges the example of the Father, from whom he derives both the power whereby he acts, and the wiſdom wherewith he teaches:—his miſſion proved by—1. the teſtimony of John;—2. the miracles he wrought;—3. the declaration of the Father at his baptiſm;—4. the Jewiſh ſcriptures. *Page* 458

SECTION V.

THE PEOPLE FED IN THE DESERT.

CH. VI. VII. 1.

Jeſus feeds five thouſand miraculouſly in the deſert;—while his diſciples embark, he retires from the multitude, who intend by force to make him king;—the night being ſtormy, he follows his diſciples, walking on the ſea;—enters their veſſel, which immediately reaches the intended port;—inſtructs the people who flock about him, as to the object moſt worthy of their labour;—he declares himſelf the bread of life, the ſource of ſpiritual nouriſhment and comfort, prefigured by the manna which the Iſraelites ate in the deſert:—his language ſo ſtrongly metaphorical proves unintelligible to many, and makes not a few withdraw altogether:—Jeſus having aſked the twelve, whether they meant to follow their example,—Peter, in name of the whole, acknowledges him the Meſſiah, profeſſing inviolable fidelity:—Jeſus acquaints them that even in their ſmall number there is one perfidious. 460

SECTION. VI.

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

CH. VII. 2, &c. VIII.

Jeſus declines going with his kinſmen to the feſtival;—when they were gone, ſets out privately;—teaches in the temple, vindicating his doctrine and miſſion:—the chief prieſts and phariſees ſend officers to ſeize him;—he continues to teach; the people are much divided about him;—the officers return without him, urging for their excuſe, the unexampled power of his ſpeeches:—the rage of the rulers mildly checked by Nicodemus:—Jeſus diſmiſſes the woman taken in adultery;—declares himſelf the light of the world; expoſes the vanity of the Jewiſh boaſts of liberty;—of their relation to Abraham;—of their relation to God:—defends himſelf againſt their abuſe;—and when they were preparing to kill him, conveys himſelf out of their reach. 463

SECTION. VII.

THE CURE OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.

CH. IX. X.

Jeſus gives ſight to a man blind from his birth:—this excites the aſtoniſhment of the neighbours:—the phariſees enquire into the fact, examining firſt the man,—afterwards his parents,—then again the man himſelf:—they acquaint him that the perſon who had cured him muſt be a bad man, becauſe he had done it on the Sabbath.—As the man who had been cured, declared his diſſent from this judgment, they expelled him the ſynagogue:—Jeſus afterwards finding the man, comforts him;—compares himſelf to the door of the fold, and to the good ſhepherd:—diviſions among the people concerning him;—his enemies charge him with blaſphemy;—he vindicates himſelf, and eludes their deſigns. 467

SECTION VIII.

LAZARUS RAISED FROM THE DEAD.

CH. XI. XII. 1—11.

Lazarus of Bethany being ſick, his ſiſters ſend word to Jeſus, who, after two days, returns to Judea, his diſciples reluctantly accompanying him: Jeſus reſtores Lazarus to life who had been four days buried;—

this

this proved the means of convincing numbers:—the rulers alarmed, convene the Sanhedrim, where the deſtruction of Jeſus is determined;—he retires into the country;—on the approach of the paſſover, meaſures are again concerted againſt Jeſus;—he comes to Bethany,—ſups with Lazarus;—his feet anointed by Mary, who is accuſed of profuſion by Judas,—but vindicated by his Maſter:—crowds flock to the houſe, to ſee not only Jeſus, but Lazarus, who had been raiſed from the dead. *Page* 470

SECTION IX.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

CH. XII. 12, &c. XIII.

Jeſus rides into Jeruſalem on an aſs, the multitude ſhouting:—ſome Greeks deſire to ſee him:—Jeſus foretells his death, and its effect in engaging diſciples;—warns his hearers to improve the preſent opportunity, of which they would ſoon be deprived:—ſeveral rulers convinced, but reſtrained, by fear, from declaring their ſentiments:—Jeſus announces his doctrine as directly from God;—waſhes the feet of his diſciples;—points out this as an example to them;—foretells that one of them would betray him;—by a token acquaints the beloved diſciple that Judas Iſcariot was the man;—recommends mutual love;—warns Peter, more confident than the reſt, of his tranſgreſſion in diſowning him. 473

SECTION X.

CONSOLATION TO THE DISCIPLES.

CH. XIV. XV. XVI. XVII.

Jeſus, before his departure, comforts his diſciples, aſſuring them that his abſence would conduce to their good, and be but temporary;—promiſes them another monitor to ſupply his place;—that he will ſoon diſcover himſelf to them, though not to the world;—the ſimilitude of the vine;—exhorts to the obſervance of his precepts, and to mutual love;—encourages them by his example to bear perſecution with conſtancy;—warns them of their danger;—acquaints them of the monitor's functions;—excites them to pray the Father in his name;—foretells that their ſorrow will be ſoon ſucceeded by joy,—and the world's joy by ſorrow;—that his people will have peace in him, but affliction in the world;—concludes with a prayer to his Father, firſt for himſelf, to glorify him in the iſſue of the awful trial;—2. for his diſciples, to preſerve them in unity and truth; 3.—for all the converts that ſhould be made to him through their miniſtry. 476

SECTION XI.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

CH. XVIII. XIX. 1—37.

Jeſus being betrayed to his enemies by Judas, manifeſts his power to thoſe ſent to apprehend him;—is brought to the high prieſt's houſe and examined;—is denied by Peter;—conſigned to Pilate, who, after enquiry, finding no cauſe for condemning,—offers, to the people, to releaſe him, according to the cuſtom which obtained at the paſſover:—the people, influenced by their rulers refuſe, Jeſus, demanding that he may be crucified, and Barabbas releaſed:—Pilate cauſes Jeſus to be ſcourged;—and, after repeated declarations of his innocence, gives him up to the will of the multitude:—Jeſus is brought with two malefactors to Calvary, carrying his croſs;—the charge of his mother he, from the croſs, recommends to to the beloved diſciple, who, from that time, took her to his own houſe:—the ſoldiers part his garments among them;—one of them, with a ſpear, pierces the ſide of Jeſus when dead. 481

SECTION XII.

THE RESURRECTION.

CH. XIX. 38, &c. XX. XXI.

The body of Jeſus given to Joſeph of Arimathea;—he and Nicodemus embalm it, and lay it in the ſepulchre:—the ſpulchre is found empty early on Sunday morning, firſt by Mary Magdalene, afterwards by Peter and

John:—ſoon after Jeſus appears to Mary Magdalene at the ſepulchre, and ſends her to acquaint his diſciples of his reſurrection, and that his aſcenſion would ſoon follow;—in the evening he appears to the Apoſtles in a houſe, and gives them commiſſion to teach:—Thomas, who had been abſent, owns, to his fellow-diſciples, his diſbelief of their teſtimony:—Jeſus appears again to the Apoſtles, Thomas being preſent, whoſe incredulity is overcome by the evidence he had wanted:—again he appears to the diſciples at the ſea of Tiberias, diſcovering himſelf by means of an extraordinary draught of fiſhes;—eats with them;—draws from Peter thrice, in preſence of the reſt, a declaration of his love to him:—Jeſus gives him charge of his flock,—and foretells his martyrdom;—rebukes his curioſity about the fate of a fellow-diſciple. It was that diſciple who wrote this Goſpel, and was witneſs of moſt of the things recorded in it.

Page 485

THE

GOSPEL

BY

JOHN.

SECTION I.

The Incarnation.

1. *IN the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and*
2. *the Word was God. This was in the beginning with God. All* Col. 1; 16.
things were made by it, and without it not a ſingle creature was made.
4. *In it was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light ſhone*
in darkneſs; but the darkneſs admitted it not.
6. *A man named John was ſent from God. This man came as a wit-* Mat. 3; 1.
neſs to teſtify concerning the light, that by his means all might believe. Mar. 1; 2.
8 *He was not himſelf the light, but came to teſtify concerning the light.*
9 *The true light was he who, coming into the world, enlighteneth every*
man.
10 *He was in the world, and the world was made by him; yet the*
11 *world knew him not. He came to his own land, and his own peo-*
12 *ple did not receive him; but to as many as received him, believing in his*
13 *name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive*
their birth not from blood, nor from the deſire of the fleſh, nor from the
will of man but from God.
14 *And the Word became incarnate, and ſojourned amongſt us (and we* Mat. 1; 16.
beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of Lu. 2; 7.
15 *grace and truth. (It was concerning him John teſtified, when he cried,*
"This is he of whom I ſaid, He that cometh after me is preferred to me;
16 *"for he was before me.") Of his fulneſs we all have received, even*
grace

17 *grace for his grace; for the law was given by Moſes, the grace and the truth*
1 Ti. 6; 16. 18 *came by Jeſus Chriſt. No one ever ſaw God; it is the only begotten*
1 Jo. 4; 12. *Son, that is in the boſom of the Father, who hath made him known.*

19 *NOW this is the teſtimony of John. When the Jews ſent prieſts*
20 *and Levites from Jeruſalem to aſk him,* Who art thou? *he acknow-*
ledged and denied not, but acknowledged, ſaying, I am not the Meſſiah.
21 *And they aſked him,* Who then? Art thou Elijah? *He ſaid,* I am not.
22 Art thou the Prophet? *He anſwered,* No. *They ſaid,* Tell then who
thou art, that we may return an anſwer to them who ſent us. What
Mat. 3; 3. 23 ſayeſt thou of thyſelf? *He anſwered,* I am he whoſe voice proclaimeth
Mar. 1; 3. in the wilderneſs, " Make ſtraight the way of the Lord (*a*)," as ſaid
Lu. 3; 4.
Iſ. 40; 3. 24 the Prophet Iſaiah. *Now they who were ſent were of the Phariſees. And*
they queſtioned him further, Why then doſt thou baptize, if thou be
Mat. 3; 11. 26 not the Meſſiah, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet? *John anſwered,* I bap-
Mar. 1; 7. tize in water, but there is one amongſt you whom ye know not.
Lu. 3; 16.
Acts, 1; 5. 27 It is he who cometh after me, and was before me, whoſe ſhoe-
11; 16. & 28 latchet I am not worthy to looſe. *This happened at Bethany, upon*
19; 4. *the Jordan, where John was baptizing.*

29 *On the morrow John ſeeth Jeſus coming to him, and ſaith,* Behold
30 the Lamb of God which taketh away the ſin of the world. This
is he concerning whom I ſaid, " After me cometh a man who is
31 " preferred to me; for he was before me." As for me, I knew him
not; but to the end that he may be diſcovered to Iſrael, I am come
Mat. 3; 16. 32 baptizing in water. *John teſtified further, ſaying,* I ſaw the Spirit
Mar. 1; 10. deſcending from heaven, like a dove, and remaining upon him.
Lu. 3; 22. 33 For my part, I had not known him, had not he who ſent me to bap-
tize in water told me, ' Upon whomſoever thou ſhalt ſee the Spirit
' deſcending and remaining, the ſame is he who baptizeth in the
34 ' Holy Ghoſt.' Having therefore ſeen this, I teſtify that he is the
Son of God.

35 *The next day John being with two of his diſciples, obſerved Jeſus*
37 *paſſing, and ſaid,* Behold the Lamb of God. *The two diſciples*
38 *hearing this, followed Jeſus. And Jeſus turning about ſaw them fol-*
lowing, and ſaid to them, What ſeek ye? *They anſwered,* Rabbi
39 *(which ſignifieth Doctor),* where dwelleſt thou? *He replied,* Come,
and ſee. *They went and ſaw where he dwelt; and it being about the*
30 *tenth hour (b), abode with him that day. One of the two who, having*
heard John, followed Jeſus, was Andrew the brother of Simon Peter.
41 *The firſt he met was his own brother Simon, to whom he ſaid,* We
42 have found the Meſſiah (c) *(a word equivalent to Chriſt (d)). And*
he brought him to Jeſus. Jeſus looking upon him, ſaid, Thou art Simon

(*a*) Jehovah. (*b*) Four o'clock afternoon. (*c*) Anointed. (*d*) Anointed.

the ſon of Jona; thou ſhalt be called Cephas (*e*), *which denoteth the the ſame as Peter* (*f*).

43 *The next day Jeſus reſolved to go to Galilee, and meeting Philip,*
44 *ſaid to him*, Follow me. *Now Philip was of Bethſaida, the city of*
45 *Andrew and Peter. Philip meeteth Nathaniel, and ſaith unto him*, We have found the perſon deſcribed by Moſes in the law, and by Gen. 49; 10. Deut. 18; 18.
46 the Prophets, Jeſus the ſon of Joſeph, from Nazareth. *Nathaniel ſaith unto him*, Out of Nazareth can any good thing come? *Philip* Jer. 23. 5.
47 *anſwered*, Come, and ſee. *Jeſus ſaw Nathaniel coming to him, and ſaid concerning him*, Behold an Iſraelite indeed, in whom is no guile.
48 *Nathaniel ſaid unto him*, Whence knoweſt thou me? *Jeſus anſwered*, I ſaw thee when thou waſt under the fig-tree, before Philip called
49 thee. *Nathaniel replying, ſaid unto him*, Rabbi, thou art the Son of
50 God: thou art the King of Iſrael. *Jeſus anſwered him, ſaying*, Becauſe I told thee that I ſaw thee under the fig-tree, thou believeſt:
51 thou ſhalt ſee greater things than this. *He added*, Verily verily I ſay unto you, Hereafter ye ſhall ſee heaven open, and the meſſengers of God aſcending from the Son of Man, and deſcending upon him.

SECTION II.

The Entrance on the Miniſtry.

II. *THREE days after there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and*
2 *the mother of Jeſus was there. Jeſus alſo and his diſciples were*
3 *invited to the marriage. The wine falling ſhort, the mother of Jeſus*
4 *ſaid to him*, They have no wine. *Jeſus anſwered*, Woman, what haſt
5 thou to do with me? My time is not yet come. *His mother ſaid to*
6 *the ſervants*, Do whatever he ſhall bid you. *Now there were ſix water-pots of ſtone, containing two or three baths* (*g*) *a-piece, placed there for*
7 *the Jewiſh rites of cleanſing. Jeſus ſaid to them*, Fill the pots with
8 water. *And they filled them to the brim. Then he ſaid*, Draw now,
9 and carry to the director of the feaſt. *And they did ſo. When the director of the feaſt had taſted the wine made of water, not knowing*
10 *whence it was (but the ſervants who drew the water knew), he ſaid, addreſſing the bridegroom*, Every body preſenteth the beſt wine firſt, and worſe wine afterwards, when the gueſts have drunk largely; but
11 thou haſt reſerved the beſt until now. *This firſt miracle Jeſus wrought in Cana of Galilee, diſplaying his glory: and his diſciples believed on him.*

(*e*) Rock. (*f*) Rock. (*g*) A bath contained about 7½ gallons.

12 *Afterwards he went to Capernaum, he and his mother and his brothers, and his diſciples; but they ſtayed not there many days.*

13 *AND the Jewiſh paſſover being nigh, Jeſus went to Jeruſalem; and*
finding changers ſitting in the temple, and people who ſold cattle, and
15 *ſheep, and doves; he made a whip of cords, and drove them all out of the*
temple, with the ſheep and the cattle, ſcattering the coin of the changers,
16 *and overſetting their tables; and ſaid to them who ſold doves.* Take
theſe things hence. Make not my Father's houſe a houſe of traffic.
17 *Then his diſciples remembered theſe words of Scripture,* "*My zeal for*
Pſ. 69; 9. "*thy houſe conſumeth me.*"
18 *Hereupon the Jews ſaid to him,* By what miracle doſt thou ſhow
Mat. 26; 61. 19 us thy title to do theſe things? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto them,* De-
& 27; 40. 20 ſtroy this temple, and I will rear it again in three days. *The Jews*
Mar. 14; 58. *replied,* Forty and ſix years was this temple in building; and thou
& 15; 29. 21 wouldſt rear it in three days? *But by the temple he meant his body.*
22 *When therefore he was riſen from the dead, his diſciples remembered*
that he had ſaid this, and they underſtood the Scripture, and the word
which Jeſus had ſpoken.
23 *While he was at Jeruſalem, during the feaſt of the paſſover, many*
believed on him, when they ſaw the miracles which he performed.
24 *But Jeſus did not truſt himſelf to them, becauſe he knew them all.*
25 *He needed not to receive from others a character of any man, for he*
knew what was in man.

III. *NOW there was a Phariſee, called Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews,*
2 *who came to Jeſus by night, and ſaid to him,* Rabbi, we know that thou
art a teacher come from God; for no man can do theſe miracles
3 which thou doſt, unleſs God be with him. *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid*
unto him, Verily verily I ſay unto thee, unleſs a man be born again,
4 he cannot diſcern the reign of God. *Nicodemus replied,* How can
a grown man be born? Can he enter his mother's womb
5 anew, and be born? *Jeſus anſwered,* Verily verily I ſay unto
thee, unleſs a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter the
6 kingdom of God. That which is born of the fleſh is fleſh; that
7 which is born of the Spirit is ſpirit. Wonder not then that I ſaid to
8 thee, Ye muſt be born again. The wind bloweth where it liſteth,
and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but knoweſt not whence it co-
meth, or whither it goeth; ſo it is with every one who is born of
9 the Spirit. *Nicodemus anſwered,* How can theſe things be? *Jeſus re-*
plied, Art thou the teacher of Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe things?
11 Verily verily I ſay unto thee, we ſpeak what we know, and teſtify
12 what we have ſeen; yet ye receive not our teſtimony. If ye
underſtood not when I told you earthly things; how will ye un-
derſtand,

derſtand, when I tell you heavenly things? For none aſcendeth
into heaven, but he who deſcended from heaven? the Son of Man,
whoſe abode is heaven. As Moſes placed on high the ſerpent in Num. 21; 9.
the wilderneſs, ſo muſt the Son of Man be placed on high, that
whoſoever believeth on him may not periſh, but obtain eternal life:
for God hath ſo loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, 1 Jo. 4; 9.
that whoſoever believeth on him may not periſh, but obtain eternal
life. For God hath ſent his Son into the world, not to condemn the ch. 12; 47.
world, but that the world may be ſaved by him. He who believeth
on him ſhall not be condemned; he who believeth not is already
condemned, becauſe he hath not believed on the name of the only
begotten Son of God. Now this is the condemnation, that the light ch. 1; 4.
is come into the world, and men have preferred the darkneſs to the
light, becauſe their deeds were evil. For whoſever doth evil, hateth
the light, and ſhunneth it, leſt his deeds ſhould be detected. But
he who obeyeth the truth cometh to the light, that it may be mani-
feſt that his actions are agreeable to God.

After this, Jeſus went with his diſciples into the territory of Judea, ch. 4; 2.
where he remained with them, and baptized. John alſo was bapti-
zing in Enon near Salim, becauſe there was much water there; and
people came thither and were baptized. For John was not yet caſt into
priſon.

Now John's diſciples had a diſpute with a Jew about purification.
Whereupon they went to John, and ſaid to him, Rabbi, he who was
with thee near the Jordan, of whom thou gaveſt ſo great a charac- ch. 1; 27. 30.
ter; he too baptizeth, and the people flock to him. *John anſwered,*
A man can have no power but what he deriveth from heaven. Ye
yourſelves are witneſſes for me, that I ſaid, 'I am not the Meſſiah,
'but am ſent before him.' The bridegroom is he who hath the ch. 1; 26.
bride; but the friend of the bridegroom, who aſſiſteth him, rejoiceth
to hear the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is complete.
He muſt increaſe, while I decreaſe. He who cometh from above,
is above all. He who is from the earth is earthly, and ſpeaketh as
being from the earth. He who cometh from heaven is above all
What he teſtifieth is what he hath ſeen and heard; yet his teſtimony
is not received. He who receiveth his teſtimony, voucheth the ve-
racity of God. For he whom God hath commiſſioned, relateth
God's own words; for [to him] God giveth not the Spirit by mea-
ſure. The Father loveth the Son, and hath ſubjected all things to him. Mat. 11; 27.
He who believeth on the Son hath life eternal; he who rejecteth the 1 Jo. 5; 10.
Son, ſhall not ſee life; but the vengeance of God awaiteth him.

SECTION III.

The Journey to Galilee.

ch. 3; 22. IV. *JESUS knowing that the Phariſees were informed that he made*
2 *and baptized more diſciples than John (though it was not Jeſus*
3 *himſelf, but his diſciples, who baptized) left Judea, and returned to*
Galilee.
4 *Being obliged to paſs through Samaria, he came to a Samaritan city*
called Sychar (b), near the heritage which Jacob gave his ſon Joſeph.
Gen. 33; 19. & 48; 22. Joſ. 24; 32. 6 *Now Jacob's well was there. And Jeſus, wearied with the journey,*
ſat down by the well, it being about the ſixth hour (i).
7 *A woman of Samaria having come to draw water, Jeſus ſaid to her,*
8 Give me to drink *(for his diſciples were gone into the city to buy food);*
9 *the Samaritan woman anſwered,* How is it that thou who art a Jew,
aſkeſt drink of me who am a Samaritan? *(for the Jews have no friendly*
10 *intercourſe with the Samaritans.) Jeſus replied,* If thou kneweſt the
bounty of God, and who it is that ſaith to thee, 'Give me to
'drink,' thou wouldſt have aſked him, and he would have given
11 thee living water. *She anſwered,* Sir, thou haſt no bucket, and
the well is deep: whence then haſt thou the living water? Art
thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank
13 thereof himſelf, and his ſons, and his cattle? *Jeſus replied,* Whoſo
14 drinketh of this water will thirſt again; but whoever ſhall drink of
the water which I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt more; but the
water which I ſhall give, ſhall be in him a fountain ſpringing up
15 to everlaſting life. *The woman anſwered,* Sir, give me this water,
16 that I may never be thirſty, nor come hither to draw. *Jeſus ſaid to*
17 *her,* Go, call thy huſband, and come back. *She anſwered,* I have
18 no huſband. *Jeſus replied,* thou ſayeſt well, 'I have no huſband;'
for thou haſt had five huſbands; and he whom thou now haſt, is
19 not thy huſband; in this thou haſt ſpoken truth. *The woman*
Deut. 12; 5. 20 *ſaid,* Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers wor-
ſhipped on this mountain; and ye ſay that in Jeruſalem is the
21 place where men ought to worſhip. *Jeſus anſwered,* Woman,
believe me, the time approacheth, when ye ſhall neither come to
22 this mountain, nor go to Jeruſalem, to worſhip the Father. Ye
worſhip what ye know not; we worſhip what we know: for
23 ſalvation is from the Jews. But the time cometh, or rather is
come, when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in
ſpirit

(b) In the Old Teſtament called *Shechem.* (i) Twelve o'clock noon.

ſpirit and truth: for ſuch are the worſhippers whom the Father
24 requireth. God is a ſpirit, and they that worſhip him, muſt 2 Cor. 3; 17.
25 worſhip him in ſpirit and truth. *The woman replied*, I know that
the Meſſiah (*k*) cometh *(that is, the Chriſt)* (*l*); when he is come,
26 he will teach us all things. *Jeſus ſaid unto her*, I who ſpeak unto
thee am he.
27 *Upon this his diſciples came and wondered that he talked with a wo-*
man; yet none of them ſaid, 'What ſeekeſt thou? or why talkeſt thou
28 *'with her? Then the woman left her pitcher, and having gone into*
29 *the city, ſaid to the people*, Come, ſee a man who hath told me all
30 that ever I did. Is this the Meſſiah? *They accordingly went out of*
the city and came to him.
31 *Meanwhile the diſciples entreating him, ſaid*, Rabbi, eat. *He anſwer-*
33 *ed*. I have meat to eat which ye know not of. *Then ſaid the diſciples*
34 *one to another*, Hath any man brought him food? *Jeſus anſwered*,
My food is to do the will of him who ſent me, and to finiſh his
35 work. Say ye not, 'After four months cometh harveſt.' But I Mat. 9; 37.
ſay, Lift up your eyes and ſurvey the fields; for they are already Lu. 10; 2.
36 white enough for harveſt. The reaper receiveth wages and gather-
eth the fruits for eternal life, that both the ſower and the reaper may
37 rejoice together. For herein the proverb is verified. 'One ſoweth
38 'and another reapeth.' I ſend you to reap that whereon ye have
beſtowed no labour: others laboured; and ye get poſſeſſion of their
labours.
39 *Now many Samaritans of that city believed in him on the teſtimony*
40 *of the woman who ſaid, 'He told me all that ever I did.' When, there-*
fore, they came to him, they beſought him to ſtay with them, and he
41 *ſtayed there two days. And many more believed becauſe of what they*
42 *heard from himſelf, and they ſaid to the woman*, It is not now on account
of what thou haſt reported, that we believe; for we have heard
him ourſelves, and know that this is truly the Saviour of the world,
the Meſſiah.
43 *After the two days Jeſus departed and went to Galilee [but not*
44 *to Nazareth]; for he had himſelf declared that a prophet is not re-* Mat. 13; 57.
45 *garded in his own country. Being come into Galilee, he was well* Mar. 6; 4.
received by the Galileans, who had ſeen all that he did at Jeruſalem Lu. 4; 24.
during the feſtival; for they likewiſe attended the feſtival.
46 *Then Jeſus returned to Cana of Galilee, where he had made the* ch. 2; 1.
water wine. And there was a certain officer of the court, whoſe ſon lay Mat. 4; 12.
47 *ſick at Capernaum, who, having heard that Jeſus was come from* Mar. 1; 14.
Judea into Galilee, went to him, entreated him to come and cure his Lu. 4; 14.
48 *ſon who was dying. Jeſus ſaid to him*, Unleſs ye ſee ſigns and prodi-

 gies,

(*k*) The Anointed. (*l*) The Anointed.

49 gies, ye will not believe. *The officer answered*, Come, Sir, before
50 my child die. *Jesus replied*, Go thy way. Thy son is well.
And the man believed the word which Jesus had spoken, and went his
51 *way. As he was returning, his servants met him, and acquainted him*
52 *that his boy was well. He then enquired of them the hour when he*
began to mend. They answered, Yesterday, at the seventh hour, the
53 fever left him. *Then the father knew that it was the same hour at*
which Jesus said to him, 'Thy son is well;' and he and all his family
54 *believed. This second miracle Jesus performed, after returning from*
Judea to Galilee.

SECTION IV.

The Cure at Bethesda.

Lev. 23; 2. V. *AFTERWARDS there was a Jewish festival, and Jesus went to*
2 *Jerusalem. Now there is at Jerusalem, nigh the sheep-gate, a*
bath, called in Hebrew Bethesda (m), which hath five covered walks.
3 *In these lay a great number of sick, blind, lame, and palsied people wait-*
4 *ing for the moving of the water. For a messenger at times descended into*
the bath, and agitated the water; and the first that stepped in after the
agitation of the water, was cured of whatever disease he had.
5 *Now there was one there who had been diseased eight and thirty*
6 *years. Jesus, who saw him lying, and knew that he had been long*
7 *ill, said to him*, Wouldst thou be healed? *The diseased man answered*,
Sir, I have nobody to put me into the bath, when the water is agi-
8 tated; but while I am going, another getteth down before me. *Jesus*
9 *said to him*, Arise, take up thy couch, and walk. *Instantly the man*
was healed, and took up his couch and walked.

Neh. 13; 19. Jer. 17. 21. 10 *Now that day was the Sabbath. The Jews therefore said to him that*
was cured, This is the Sabbath. It is not lawful for thee to carry
11 the couch. *He answered*, He who healed me, said to me, 'Take
12 'up thy couch and walk.' *They asked him then*, Who is the man
13 that said to thee, 'Take up thy couch and walk?' *But he that had*
been healed, knew not who it was; for Jesus had slipt away, there
being a crowd in the place.
14 *Jesus afterwards finding him in the temple, said to him*, Behold
15 thou art cured; sin no more, lest something worse befal thee. *The*
man went and told the Jews that it was Jesus who had cured him.
16 *Therefore the Jews persecuted Jesus, and sought to kill him, because*
he had done this on the Sabbath.

But

(*m*) House of mercy.

17 *But Jeſus anſwered them*, As my Father hitherto worketh, I work.
18 *For this reaſon the Jews were the more intent to kill him, becauſe*
he had not only broken the Sabbath, but by calling God peculiarly his
19 *Father, had equalled himſelf with God. Then Jeſus addreſſed them,*
ſaying, Verily verily I ſay unto you, the Son can do nothing of him-
ſelf, but as he ſeeth the Father do: for what things ſoever he
20 doth, ſuch doth the Son likewiſe. For the Father loveth the
Son, and ſhoweth him all that he himſelf doth: nay, and will
ſhow him greater works than theſe, works which will aſtoniſh you.
21 For as the Father raiſeth and quickeneth the dead, the Son alſo
22 quickeneth whom he will: for the Father judgeth no perſon, having
23 committed the power of judging entirely to the Son, that all
might honour the Son, as they honour the Father. He that ho-
24 noureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who ſent him. Ve-
rily verily I ſay unto you, He who heareth my doctrine, and believeth
him who ſent me, hath eternal life, and ſhall not incur condem-
25 nation, having paſſed from death to life. Verily verily I ſay unto
you, the time cometh, or rather is come, when the dead ſhall
26 hear the voice of the Son of God, and hearing they ſhall live. For
as the Father hath life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son
27 to have life in himſelf; and hath given him even the judicial
28 authority, becauſe he is a Son of Man. Wonder not at this; for
the time cometh when all that are in the graves ſhall hear his voice,
29 and ſhall come forth. They that have done good, ſhall ariſe to enjoy Mat. 25; 46.
30 life; they that have done evil, ſhall ariſe to ſuffer puniſhment. I can do
nothing of myſelf; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is juſt, becauſe
I ſeek not to pleaſe myſelf, but to pleaſe the Father who ſent me.
31 If I [alone] teſtify concerning myſelf, my teſtimony is not to be
32 regarded: there is another who teſtifieth concerning me; and I
33 know that his teſtimony of me ought to be regarded. Ye yourſelves ch. 1; 7. 15.
34 ſent to John, and he bore witneſs to the truth. As for me, I need 19. 29.
35 no human teſtimony; I only urge this for your ſalvation. He was
the lighted and ſhining lamp; and for a while ye were glad to en-
joy his light,
36 But I have greater teſtimony than John's; for the works which
the Father hath empowered me to perform, the works themſelves
which I do, teſtify for me, that the Father hath ſent me.
37 Nay, the Father who ſent me, hath himſelf atteſted me. Did Mat. 3; 16.
38 ye never hear his voice, or ſee his form? Or have ye forgotten his Mar. 1; 10.
declaration, that ye believe not him whom he hath commiſſioned? Lu. 3; 22.
39 Ye ſearch the Scriptures, becauſe ye think to obtain, by their
40 means, eternal life. Now theſe alſo are witneſſes for me; yet ye
41 will not come unto me that ye may obtain life. I deſire not honour
42 from men; but I know you, that ye are ſtrangers to the love of
God.

43 God. I am come in my Father's name, and ye do not receive me;
ch. 12; 43. 44 if another come in his own name, ye will receive him. How
can ye believe, while ye court honour one from another, regardleſs
45 of the honour which cometh from God alone? Do not think that I
am he who will accuſe you to the Father. Your accuſer is Moſes,
46 in whom ye confide. For if ye believed Moſes, ye would believe
Deut. 18; 15. 47 me, for he wrote concerning me. But if ye believe not his writ-
ings, how ſhall ye believe my words?

SECTION V.

The People fed in the Deſert.

VI. *AFTERWARDS Jeſus croſſed the ſea of Galilee [alſo called] of*
2 *Tiberias: and a great multitude followed him, becauſe they had*
3 *ſeen the miraculous cures which he performed. And Jeſus went up*
4 *upon a mountain; where he ſat down with his diſciples. Now the paſſ-*
over, the Jewiſh feſtival, was near.

Mat. 14; 15. Mar. 6; 35. Lu. 9; 12. 5 *Jeſus lifting up his eyes, and perceiving that a great multitude*
was flocking to him, ſaid to Philip, Whence ſhall we buy bread to
6 feed theſe people? *(This he ſaid to try him; for he knew himſelf what*
7 *he was to do.) Philip anſwered,* Two hundred denarii (*n*) would
8 not purchaſe bread enough to afford every one a morſel. *One of his*
9 *diſciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, ſaid to him,* Here is a
boy who hath five barley loaves, and two ſmall fiſhes; but what
10 are they among ſo many? *Jeſus ſaid,* Make the men lie down.
Now there was much graſs in the place. So they lay down, in num-
11 *ber about five thouſand. And Jeſus took the loaves, and having*
given thanks, diſtributed them to thoſe who had lien down. He
12 *gave them alſo of the fiſhes, as much as they would. When they*
had eaten ſufficiently, he ſaid to his diſciples, Gather up the frag-
13 ments which remain, that nothing be loſt. *They therefore gather-*
ed, and with the fragments which the people had left, of the five
14 *barley loaves, they filled twelve baſkets. When thoſe men had ſeen*
the miracle which Jeſus had wrought, they ſaid, This is certainly
15 the prophet who cometh into the world. *Then Jeſus knowing that*
Mat. 14; 22. *they intended to come, and carry him off to make him king, with-*
drew again alone to the mountain.

Mar. 6; 45. 16. *In the evening his diſciples went to the ſea, and having embarked,*
were paſſing by ſea to Capernaum. It was now dark, and Jeſus
18 *was not come to them, And the water was raiſed by a tempeſtuous*
wind

(*n*) About 6 l. 5 s. ſterling.

19 *wind. When they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs* (o), *they obſerved Jeſus walking on the ſea, very near the*
20 *bark, and were afraid. But he ſaid to them,* It is I, be not
21 afraid. *Then they gladly received him into the bark; and the bark was immediately at the place whither they were going.*
22 *On the morrow the people who were on the ſea-ſide, knowing that there had been but one boat there, and that Jeſus went not into*
23 *the boat with his diſciples, who went alone (other boats however arrived from Tiberias, nigh the place where they had eaten, after*
24 *the Lord had given thanks), knowing beſides, that neither Jeſus nor his diſciples were there, embarked and went to Capernaum ſeeking Jeſus.*
25 *Having found him on the oppoſite ſhore, they ſaid to him,* Rabbi,
26 when cameſt thou hither? *Jeſus anſwered,* Verily verily I ſay unto you, Ye ſeek me, not becauſe ye ſaw miracles, but becauſe
27 ye ate of the loaves, and were ſatisfied. Work not for the food which periſheth, but for the food which endureth through eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you: for to him the Father, Mat. 3; 17.
28 that is, God, hath given his atteſtation. *They aſked him, there-* Mar. 1; 11.
29 *fore,* What are the works which God requireth us to do? *Jeſus* Lu. 3; 22.
anſwered, This is the work which God requireth, that ye believe
30 on him whom he hath commiſſioned. *They replied,* What miracle 1 Jo. 3; 23.
then doſt thou, that ſeeing it, we may believe thee? What doſt
31 thou perform? Our fathers ate the manna in the deſert, as it is Ex. 16; 14.
32 written, "He gave them bread of heaven to eat." *Jeſus then ſaid* Num. 11; 6.
to them, Verily verily I ſay unto you, Moſes did not give you the Pſ. 78; 25.
bread of heaven; But my Father giveth you the true bread of Wiſ. 16; 20.
33 heaven: for the bread of God is that which deſcendeth from hea-
34 ven and giveth life to the word. *They ſaid therefore to him,* Maſter,
35 give us always this bread. *Jeſus anſwered,* I am the bread of life. He who cometh to me ſhall never hunger, and he who believeth on me ſhall never thirſt.
36 But as I told you, though ye have ſeen me, ye do not believe.
37 Whatever the Father giveth me, will come to me; and him who
38 cometh to me I will not reject. For I deſcended from heaven to do, not mine own will, but the will of him who ſent me. Now
39 this is the will of him who ſent me, that I ſhould loſe nothing of what he hath given me, but raiſe the whole again at the laſt day.
40 This is the will of him who ſent me, that whoever recognizeth the Son and believeth on him, ſhould obtain eternal life, and that I ſhould raiſe him again at the laſt day.
41 *The Jews then murmured againſt him, becauſe he ſaid,* "*I am the*
42 "*bread which deſcended from heaven:*" *and they ſaid,* Is not this

(o) Between three and four miles.

Mat. 13; 55. Mar. 6; 3. Jeſus, the ſon of Joſeph, whoſe father and mother we know? 43 How then doth he ſay, "I deſcended from heaven?" *Jeſus there-* 44 *fore anſwered*, Murmur not amongſt yourſelves: no man can come unto me, unleſs the Father, who hath ſent me, draw him; and him Is. 54; 13. 45 I will raiſe again at the laſt day. It is written in the prophets, "They ſhall be all taught of God." Every one who hath heard Mat. 11; 27. 46 and learnt from the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man, except him who is from God, hath ſeen the Father. He indeed hath 47 ſeen the Father. Verily verily I ſay unto you, He who believeth 48 on me hath eternal life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers ate 50 the manna in the deſert and died. This is the bread which deſcended 51 from heaven, that whoſo eateth thereof, may not die. I am the living bread which deſcended from heaven. Whoſo eateth of this bread ſhall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world.

52 *The Jews then debated among themſelves, ſaying*, How can this man 53 give us his fleſh to eat? *Jeſus therefore ſaid to them*, Verily verily I ſay unto you, Unleſs ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink 54 his blood, ye have not life in you. He that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raiſe him again at the 55 laſt day: for my fleſh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink. He who eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I 57 abide in him. As the Father liveth who ſent me, and I live by 58 the Father; even ſo he who eateth me, ſhall live by me. This is the bread which deſcended from heaven. It is not like the manna which your fathers ate, for they died: he that eateth this bread 59 ſhall live for ever. *This diſcourſe he ſpake in a ſynagogue teaching in Capernaum.*

60 *Many of his diſciples having heard it, ſaid*, This is hard doctrine, 61 who can bear it? *Jeſus knowing in himſelf that his diſciples murmured* 62 *at it, ſaid to them*, Doth this ſcandalize you; What if ye ſhould ſee 63 the Son of Man reaſcending thither, where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the fleſh profiteth nothing. The words 64 which I ſpeak unto you are ſpirit and life. But there are ſome of you who do not believe, *(for Jeſus knew from the beginning who they* 65 *were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him.) He added*, Therefore I ſaid to you, that no man can come unto me, unleſs it be given him by my Father.

66 *From this time many of his diſciples withdrew, and accompanied him* 67 *no longer. Then ſaid Jeſus to the twelve*, Will ye alſo go away? 68 *Simon Peter anſwered*, Maſter, to whom ſhould we go? Thou haſt Mat. 16; 16. Mar. 8; 29. Lu. 9; 20. 69 the words of eternal life: and we believe, and know that thou art 70 the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God. *Jeſus anſwered them*, 71 Have not I choſen you twelve? yet one of you is a ſpy. *He meant*

Judas

Judas Iſcariot ſon of Simon; for it was he who was to betray him, though he was one of the twelve.

VII. *After this Jeſus travelled about in Galilee; for he would not reſide in Judea, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.*

SECTION VI.

The Feaſt of Tabernacles.

2 NOW *the Jewiſh feaſt of tabernacles was near. His brothers,* Lev. 23; 34.
therefore, ſaid to him, Leave this country, and go into
Judea, that thy diſciples may alſo ſee the works which thou doſt.
4 For whoſoever courteth renown, doth nothing in ſecret: ſince thou
5 performeſt ſuch things, ſhow thyſelf to the world. *(For not even*
6 *his brothers believed on him.) Jeſus anſwered,* My time is not yet
7 come, any time will ſuit you. The world cannot hate you; but me
8 it hateth, becauſe I diſcloſe the wickedneſs of its actions. Go ye ch. 8; 20.
to this feſtival. I go not yet thither, becauſe it is not yet my time.
9 *Having ſaid this, he remained in Galilee.*
10 *But when his brothers were gone, he alſo went to the feſtival, not*
11 *publicly, but rather privately. At the feſtival the Jews enquired after*
12 *him, and ſaid,* Where is he? *And there was much whiſpering among*
the people concerning him. Some ſaid, He is a good man. *Others,*
13 No; he ſeduceth the multitude. *Nobody, however, ſpake openly of*
him for fear of the Jews.
14 *About the middle of the feſtival, Jeſus went into the temple and was*
15 *teaching. And the Jews ſaid with aſtoniſhment,* Whence cometh
16 this man's learning who was never taught? *Jeſus made anſwer,*
17 My doctrine is not mine, but his who ſent me. Whoſoever is
minded to do his will, ſhall diſcern whether my doctrine proceed
18 from God or from myſelf. Whoever teacheth what proceedeth from
himſelf, ſeeketh to promote his own glory; whoſoever ſeeketh
to promote the glory of him who ſent him, deſerveth credit, and
19 is a ſtranger to deceit. Did not Moſes give you the law? Yet none Ex. 24; 3.
20 of you keepeth the law. Why do ye ſeek to kill me? *The people* ch. 5; 18.
21 *anſwered,* Thou art poſſeſſed. Who ſeeketh to kill thee? *Jeſus re-*
22 *plied,* I have performed one action which ſurprizeth you all. Moſes Lev. 12; 3.
inſtituted circumciſion amongſt you (not that it is from Moſes,
23 but from the patriarchs), and ye circumciſe on the Sabbath (*p*). If on Gen. 17; 10.
the Sabbath (*q*) a child receive circumciſion, that the law of Moſes
may not be violated; are ye incenſed againſt me becauſe I have,
24 on the Sabbath (*r*), cured a man whoſe whole body was diſeaſed? Deut. 1; 16.
Judge not from perſonal regards, but judge according to juſtice.

Then

(*p*) Saturday. (*q*) Saturday. (*r*) Saturday.

25 *Then ſome inhabitants of Jeruſalem ſaid,* Is not this he whom
26 they ſeek to kill? Lo! he ſpeaketh boldly, and they ſay nothing to
27 him. Do the rulers indeed acknowledge that this is the Meſſiah? But
we know whence this man is; whereas, when the Meſſiah, ſhall
28 come, nobody will know whence he is. *Jeſus, who was then*
teaching in the temple, cried, Do ye know, both who, and whence, I
am? I came not of myſelf. But he is true who ſent me, whom ye
29 know not. As for me, I know him, becauſe I came from him, and
30 am commiſſioned by him. *Then they ſought to apprehend him, but*
31 *none laid hands on him; for his hour was not yet come. Many of*
the people, however, believed on him, and ſaid, When the Meſſiah ſhall
come, will he do more miracles than this man doth?
32 *When the phariſees heard that the people muttered ſuch things concer-*
33 *ning him, they and the chief prieſts diſpatched officers to ſeize him. Jeſus*
therefore ſaid, Yet a little while I remain with you; then I go
ch. 13; 33. 34 to him who ſent me. Ye ſhall ſeek me, but ſhall not find me, nor
35 be able to get thither where I ſhall be. *Then the Jews ſaid among*
themſelves, Whither will he go that we ſhall not find him? Will he
36 go to the diſperſed among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks? What
meaneth he by ſaying, "Ye ſhall ſeek me, but ſhall not find me,
Lev. 23; 36. 37 nor be able to get thither where I ſhall be?" *On the laſt and great-*
eſt day of the feſtival Jeſus ſtood and cried, ſaying, If any man thirſt,
38 let him come unto me and drink. He who believeth on me, as
Iſ. 44; 3. Scripture ſaith, ſhall prove a ciſtern whence rivers of living water
Joel, 2; 28. Acts, 2; 16. 39 ſhall flow. *This he ſpake of the Spirit which they who believed*
on him were to receive; for the Spirit was not yet [*given*], *becauſe*
40 *Jeſus was not yet glorified. Many of the people having heard what*
41 *was ſpoken, ſaid,* This is certainly the Prophet. *Some ſaid,* This
is the Meſſiah. *Others,* Doth the Meſſiah come from Galilee?
42 Doth not Scripture ſay, that the Meſſiah will be of the poſterity of
David, and come from Bethlehem, the village whence David was?
Mic. 5; 2. Mat. 2; 5 43 *Thus the people were divided concerning him; and ſome of them would*
have ſeized him, but nobody laid hands upon him.
45 *Then the officers returned to the chief prieſts and phariſees, who*
46 *aſked them,* Wherefore have ye not brought him? *The officers an-*
47 *ſwered,* Never man ſpake like this man. *The phariſees replied,* Are
48 ye alſo ſeduced? Hath any of the rulers, or of the phariſees, believed
49 on him? But this populace which knoweth not the law is ac-
ch. 3; 2. 50 curſed. *Nicodemus, one of themſelves (he who came to Jeſus by*
Deut. 17; 8. and 19; 15. 51 *night), ſaid to them,* Doth our law permit us to condemn any man
52 without hearing him, and knowing his actions? *They anſwered him,*
Art thou alſo a Galilean? Search and thou wilt find, that prophets
53 ariſe not out of Galilee. [*Then every man went to his own houſe:*
VIII. *but Jeſus went to the Mount of Olives.*

2. *EARLY in the morning he returned to the temple, and all the*
3 *people having come to him, he ſat down and taught them. Then the*
ſcribes and the phariſees brought to him a woman taken in adultery,
4 *and having placed her in the middle, ſaid to him,* Rabbi, this woman
5 was ſurprized in the act of adultery. Now Moſes hath commanded Lev. 20; 10.
6 in the law that ſuch ſhould be ſtoned, but what ſayeſt thou? *They*
ſaid this to try him, that they might have matter for accuſing him. But
Jeſus having ſtooped down was writing with his finger upon the ground.
7 *As they continued aſking him, he raiſed himſelf and ſaid to them,* Let
8 him who is ſinleſs amongſt you, throw the firſt ſtone at her. *Again* Deut. 17; 7.
9 *having ſtooped down, he wrote upon the ground. They hearing that,*
withdrew one after another, the eldeſt firſt, till Jeſus was left alone
10 *with the woman ſtanding in the middle. Jeſus raiſing himſelf, and*
ſeeing none but the woman, ſaid to her, Woman, where are thoſe thine
11 accuſers? Hath nobody paſſed ſentence on thee? *She anſwered,*
Nobody, Sir. *Jeſus ſaid unto her,* Neither do I paſs ſentence on thee.
Go and ſin no more.]
12 *AGAIN Jeſus addreſſed the people ſaying,* I am the light of the ch. 1; 4.
world: he who followeth me ſhall not walk in darkneſs, but ſhall & 9; 5.
13 have the light of life. *The phariſees, therefore retorted,* Thou te-
ſtifieſt concerning thyſelf, thy teſtimony is not to be regarded.
14 *Jeſus anſwered,* Though I teſtify concerning myſelf, my teſtimony
ought to be regarded; becauſe I know whence I came, and
whither I go. As for you, ye know not whence I come and whi-
15 ther I go. Ye judge from paſſion, I judge nobody: and if I do,
my judgment ought to be regarded; for I am not ſingle, but
17 concur with the Father who ſent me. It is a maxim in your law that Deut. 17; 6.
18 the concurrent teſtimony of two is credible. Now I am one who & 19; 15.
teſtify concerning myſelf; the Father that ſent me is another who
19 teſtifieth of me. *Then they aſked him,* Where is thy Father? *Jeſus*
anſwered, Ye know neither me, nor my Father: if ye knew me, ye
20 would know my Father alſo. *Theſe things Jeſus ſpake in the*
treaſury, as he taught in the temple, and nobody ſeized him, his hour not
being yet come.
21 *Again Jeſus ſaid to them,* I am going away; ye will ſeek me, and
22 ſhall die in your ſin; whither I go, ye cannot come. *Then ſaid the*
Jews, will he kill himſelf, that he ſaith, "Whither I go, ye cannot
23 come?" *He ſaid to them,* Ye are from beneath; I am from above.
24 Ye are of this world; I am not of this world; therefore I ſaid, ye
ſhall die in your ſins; for if ye believe not that I am he, ye
25 ſhall die in your ſins. *They therefore aſked him,* who art thou?
26 *Jeſus anſwered,* The ſame that I told you formerly. I have many
things to ſay of you, and to reprove in you: but he who ſent
me is worthy of belief; and I do but publiſh to the world what

27 I have learnt from him. *They did not perceive that he meant the Father.*
28 *Jesus therefore said to them*, When ye shall have raised the Son of Man on high; then ye shall know what I am; and that I do nothing of myself, and say nothing which the Father hath not
29 taught me. And he who sent me is with me. The Father hath
30 not left me alone, because I always do what pleaseth him. *While*
31 *he spake thus, many believed on him. Jesus, therefore, said to those Jews who believed him*, If ye persist in my doctrine, ye are my
32 disciples indeed. And ye shall know the truth; and the truth shall make you free.

33 *Some made answer*, We are Abraham's offspring, and were never enslaved to any man. How sayest thou, 'Ye shall be made free?'
34 *Jesus replied*, Verily verily I say unto you, whosoever committeth
Ro. 6; 16. 35 sin is a slave to sin. Now the slave abideth not in the family perpe-
2 Pet. 2; 19. 36 tually; the Son abideth perpetually. If, therefore, the Son make
37 you free, ye will be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's offspring, yet ye seek to kill me, because my doctrine
38 hath no place in you. I speak what I have seen with my Father;
39 and ye do what ye have learnt from your father. *They answered*, Abraham is our father. *Jesus replied*, If ye were Abraham's children,
40 ye would act as Abraham acted. But now ye seek to kill me, a man who have told you the truth which I received from God.
41 Abraham acted not thus. Ye do the deeds of your father. *They answered*, We were not born of fornication. We have one Father,
42 even God. *Jesus replied*, If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded, and am come from God. I came not of
43 myself. He sent me. Why do ye not understand my language?
1 Jo. 3; 8. 44 It is because ye cannot bear my doctrine. The devil is your father, and the desires of your father ye will gratify: he was a manslayer from the beginning: he swerved from the truth, because there is no veracity in him. When he telleth a lie, he speaketh suitably to
45 his character; for he is a liar and the father of lying. As for me,
46 because I speak the truth, ye do not believe me. Which of you convicteth me of falsehood? And if I speak truth, why do ye not
1 Jo. 4; 6. 47 believe me? He who is of God regardeth God's words. Ye regard them not, because ye are not of God.

48 *The Jews then answered*, Have we not reason to say, Thou art a
49 Samaritan and hast a demon? *Jesus replied*, I have not a demon;
50 but I honour my Father, and ye dishonour me. As for me, I seek not to promote my own glory, another seeketh it who judgeth.
51 Verily verily I say unto you, Whoever keepeth my word, shall
52 never see death. *The Jews then said to him*, Now we are certain that thou hast a demon: Abraham is dead, and the prophets; yet thou sayest, 'whoever keepeth my word, shall never taste death.'

53 'death." Art thou greater than our father Abraham, who is dead?
54 The prophets alſo are dead, whom thinkeſt thou thyſelf? *Jeſus anſwered*, If I commend myſelf, my commendation is nothing: it is
55 my Father whom ye call your God who commendeth me. Nevertheleſs ye know him not; but I know him; and if I ſhould ſay, I know him not, I ſhould ſpeak falſely like you: but I know him, and
56 keep his word. Abraham your father longed to ſee my day, and
57 he ſaw and rejoiced. *The Jews replied*, Thou art not yet fifty
58 years old, and thou haſt ſeen Abraham? *Jeſus anſwered*, Verily
59 verily I ſay unto you, Before Abraham was born, I am. *Then they took up ſtones to caſt at him; but Jeſus concealed himſelf and went out of the temple, paſſing through the midſt of them.*

SECTION VII.

The Cure of the Man born blind.

IX. *AS he paſſed along, he ſaw a man who had been born blind.*
2 *And his diſciples aſked him, ſaying*, Rabbi, who ſinned; this man
3 or his parents, that he was born blind? *Jeſus anſwered*, Neither this man nor his parents ſinned. It was only that the works of God
4 might be diſplayed upon him. I muſt do the work of him who ſent me, while it is day; night cometh when no man can work.
5 While I am in the world, I am the light of the world. *Having* ch. 1; 9.
ſaid this, he ſpat upon the ground, and with the clay which he made
7 *with the ſpittle, anointed the blind man's eyes, and ſaid to him*, Go waſh thine eyes in the pool of Siloam *(which ſignifieth ſent). He went therefore and waſhed them, and returned ſeeing.*
8 *Then the neighbours, and they who had before ſeen him blind, ſaid,*
9 Is not this he who ſat and begged? *Some ſaid*, It is he; *others*, He is
10 like him. *He ſaid*, I am he. *They aſked him then*, How didſt thou
11 receive thy ſight? *He anſwered*, A man called Jeſus, made clay and anointed mine eyes, and ſaid to me, 'Go to the pool of Siloam 'and waſh thine eyes.' I went accordingly and waſhed them, and
12 ſaw. *Then they aſked him*, Where is he? *He anſwered*, I know not.
13 *Then they brought him who had been blind to the phariſees: (now*
it was on a Sabbath that Jeſus made the clay and gave him his
15 *ſight.) The phariſees likewiſe therefore aſked him, how he had received his ſight. He anſwered*, He put clay on mine eyes, and I waſhed
16 them, and now ſee. *Upon this ſome of the phariſees ſaid*, This man is not from God, for he obſerveth not the Sabbath. *Others ſaid*, How can one that is a ſinner perform ſuch miracles? *And they*

were

17 *were divided among themſelves. Again they aſked the man who had*
been blind, What ſayeſt thou of him for giving thee ſight? *He*
anſwered, He is a Prophet.
18 *But the Jews believed not that the man had been blind, and had*
19 *received his ſight, until they called his parents and aſked them,* Do ye
ſay that this is your ſon who was born blind? How then doth he
20 now ſee? *His parents anſwered,* We know that this is our ſon, and
21 that he was born blind; but how he now ſeeth we know not. He
22 is of age, aſk him; he will anſwer for himſelf. *His parents ſpoke*
thus, becauſe they feared the Jews: for the Jews had already deter-
mined that whoſoever acknowledged Jeſus to be the Meſſiah ſhould be
23 *expelled the ſynagogue. For this reaſon his parents ſaid,* "*He is of*
"*age, aſk him.*"
24 *A ſecond time, therefore they called the man who had been born*
blind, and ſaid to him, Give glory to God; we know that this
25 man is a ſinner. *He replied,* Whether he be a ſinner, I know not: one
26 thing I know, that I was blind, and now ſee. *They ſaid to him again,*
27 What did he to thee? How did he make thee ſee? *He anſwered,*
I told you before, did ye not hear? Why would ye hear it
28 repeated? Will ye alſo be his diſciples? *Then they reviled him and*
ſaid, Thou art his diſciple. As for us, we are diſciples of Moſes.
29 We know that God ſpake to Moſes; as for this man, we know
30 not whence he is. *The man replied,* This is ſurprizing that ye
know not whence he is, although he hath given me ſight.
Pſ. 66; 18. 31 We know that God heareth not ſinners; but if any man worſhip
32 God, and obey him, that man he heareth. Never was it heard be-
33 fore that any man gave ſight to one born blind. If this man were
34 not from God, he could do nothing. *They replied,* Thou waſt alto-
gether born in ſins, and doſt thou teach us? *And they caſt him out.*
35 *Jeſus heard that they had caſt him out, and having met him, ſaid*
36 *to him,* Doſt thou believe on the Son of God? *He anſwered,* Who
37 is he, Sir, that I may believe on him? *Jeſus ſaid to him,* Not only
38 haſt thou ſeen him; but it is he who talketh with thee. *And he*
39 *cried,* Maſter, I believe, *and threw himſelf proſtrate before him. And*
Jeſus ſaid, For judgment am I come into this world, that they who
40 ſee not, may ſee; and they who ſee, may become blind. *Some*
phariſees, who were preſent, hearing this, ſaid to him, Are we alſo
41 blind? *Jeſus anſwered,* If ye were blind, ye would not have ſin; but
ye ſay, 'We ſee,' therefore your ſin remaineth.
X. Verily verily I ſay unto you, he who entereth not by the door
into the ſheep-fold, but climbeth over the fence, is a thief and a
2 robber. The ſhepherd always entereth by the door. To him the
door-keeper openeth, and the ſheep obey his voice. His own
4 ſheep he calleth by name and leadeth out. And having put out

his ſheep, he walketh before them, and they follow him, becauſe
5 they know his voice. They will not follow a ſtranger, but flee
6 from him, becauſe they know not the voice of ſtrangers. *Jeſus addreſſed this ſimilitude to them, but they did not comprehend what he*
7 *ſaid. He therefore added,* Verily verily I ſay unto you, I am the
8 door of the fold. All who have entered [in another manner] are
9 thieves and robbers, but the ſheep obeyed them not. I am the door: ſuch as enter by me ſhall be ſafe: they ſhall go in and out,
10 and find paſture. The thief cometh only to ſteal, to ſlay, and to deſtroy. I am come that they may have life, and more than life.

11 I am the good ſhepherd. The good ſhepherd giveth his life Iſ. 40; 11.
12 for the ſheep. The hireling, who is not the ſhepherd, and to Ezek. 34; 23. & 37; 24.
whom the ſheep do not belong, when he ſeeth the wolf coming, abandoneth the ſheep and fleeth: and the wolf teareth ſome and
13 diſperſeth the flock. The hireling fleeth, becauſe he is a hireling,
14 and careth not for the ſheep. I am the good ſhepherd. I both know
15 my own and am known by them; (even as the Father knoweth me, Mat. 11; 27.
16 and I know the father;) and I give my life for the ſheep. I have Luke 10 22.
other ſheep beſides, which are not of this fold. Them I muſt alſo bring; and they will obey my voice; and there ſhall be one flock,
17 one ſhepherd. For this the Father loveth me, becauſe I give Iſ. 53; 7.
18 my life to be afterwards reſumed. No one forceth it from me; Acts, 2; 24.
but I give it of myſelf. I have power to give it, and I have power to reſume it. This commiſſion I have received from my Father.

19 *Again there was a diviſion among the Jews occaſioned by this diſ-*
20 *courſe. Many of them ſaid,* He hath a demon and is mad, why do
21 ye hear him? *Others ſaid,* Theſe are not the words of a demoniac. Can a demon give ſight to the blind?

22 *ONCE, when they were celebrating the feaſt of the dedication at* 1 Mac. 4; 59.
23 *Jeruſalem, it being winter; as Jeſus walked in the temple in Solomon's*
24 *portico, the Jews ſurrounding him, ſaid to him,* How long wilt thou keep us in ſuſpenſe? If thou be the Meſſiah, tell us plainly.
25 *Jeſus anſwered,* I ſaid to you, but ye believed not; 'the works which
26 'I do in my Father's name teſtify of me.' As for you, ye believe
27 not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep. 'My ſheep,' as I told you,
28 'obey my voice;' I know them, and they follow me. Beſides, I give them eternal life; and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall
29 any one wreſt them out of my hands. My Father, who gave them me, is greater than all; and none can wreſt them out of
30 my Father's hand. I and the Father are one.

31 *Then the Jews again took up ſtones to ſtone him. Jeſus ſaid to them,* Many good works I have ſhown you from my Father; for

33 which of thoſe works do ye ſtone me? *The Jews anſwered*, For a
good work we do not ſtone thee; but for blaſphemy, becauſe thou,
34 being man, makeſt thyſelf God. *Jeſus replied*, Is it not written in
Pſ. 82; 6. 35 your law, "I ſaid, Ye are gods?" If the law ſtyled them gods to
whom the word of God was addreſſed, and if the language of
36 ſcripture is unexceptionable; do ye charge him with blaſphemy,
whom the Father hath conſecrated his Apoſtle to the world, for
37 calling himſelf his Son? If I do not the works of my Father, believe
38 me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the
works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and
I in him.

39. *Thereupon they attempted again to ſeize him; but he eſcaped out of*
40 *their hands, and retired again towards the Jordan, and abode in the*
41 *place where John firſt baptized. And many reſorted to him, who ſaid,*
John indeed wrought no miracle; but all that John ſpake of this
42 man is true. *And many believed on him there.*

SECTION VIII.

Lazarus raiſed from the Dead.

XI. *NOW one Lazarus of Bethany, the village of Mary and her ſiſter*
ch. 12; 3. 2 *Martha, was ſick. (It was that Mary who anointed the Lord*
with balſam, and wiped his feet with her hair, whoſe brother
3 *Lazarus was ſick.) The ſiſters therefore ſent to tell Jeſus:* Maſter,
4 lo, he whom thou loveſt is ſick. *Jeſus hearing it, ſaid*, This
ſickneſs will not prove fatal, but conduce to the glory of God,
5 that the Son of God may be glorified thereby. *Now Jeſus*
6 *loved Martha, and her ſiſter, and Lazarus. Having then heard that*
he was ſick, Jeſus ſtayed two days in the place where he was.
7 *Afterwards he ſaid to the diſciples*, Let us return to Judea.
8 *The diſciples anſwered*, Rabbi, but very lately the Jews would have
9 ſtoned thee, and wouldeſt thou return thither? *Jeſus replied*, Are
there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day,
he ſtumbleth not, becauſe he ſeeth the light of this world:
10 but if he walk in the night, he ſtumbleth; becauſe there is no
11 light. *Having ſpoken thus, he added*, Our friend Lazarus ſleepeth;
12 but I go to wake him. *Then ſaid his diſciples*, Maſter, if he ſleep,
13 he will recover. *Jeſus ſpake of his death; but they thought that he*
14 *ſpoke of the repoſe of ſleep. Then Jeſus told them plainly*, Lazarus is
15 dead. And on your account I am glad that I was not there, that

ye

16 ye may believe; but let us go to him. *Then Thomas (s), that is Didymus (t), ſaid to his fellow-diſciples*, Let us alſo go that we may die with him.

17 *When Jeſus came, he found that Lazarus had been already four days*
18 *in the tomb. (Now Bethany being but about fifteen furlongs (u) from*
19 *Jeruſalem,) many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary to comfort*
20 *them on the death of their brother. Martha, having heard that Jeſus was coming, went and met him; but Mary remained in the houſe.*
21 *Then Martha ſaid to Jeſus*, Maſter, if thou hadſt been here, my
22 brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatſoever thou Lu. 14; 14.
23 ſhalt aſk of God, God will give thee. *Jeſus ſaid to her*, Thy ch. 5; 29.
24 brother ſhall riſe again. *Martha replied*, I know that he will riſe & 6; 40.
25 again at the reſurrection on the laſt day. *Jeſus ſaid to her*, I am the reſurrection and the life. He who believeth on me, though he
26 were dead, ſhall live; and no man who liveth and believeth on me,
27 ſhall ever die. Believeſt thou this? *She anſwered*, Yes, Maſter, I believe that thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God, he who cometh
28 into the world. *Having ſaid this, ſhe went and called Mary her ſiſter, whiſpering her*, The teacher is come, and calleth for thee.
29 *When Mary heard this, ſhe inſtantly roſe and went to him. Now*
31 *Jeſus had not yet entered the village, but was in the place where Martha met him. The Jews then, who were condoling with Mary in the houſe, when they ſaw that ſhe aroſe haſtily, and went out, followed her, ſaying*, She is going to the tomb to weep there. *Mary being come to the place where Jeſus was, and ſeeing him, threw herſelf at his feet, ſaying*, Hadſt thou been here, Maſter, my brother had not died.
33 *When Jeſus ſaw her weeping, and the Jews weeping who came with her,*
34 *he groaned deeply, and was troubled, and ſaid*, Where have ye laid
35 him? *They anſwered*, Maſter, come and ſee. *Jeſus wept. The Jews*
37 *therefore ſaid*, Mark how he loved him. *But ſome of them ſaid*, ch. 9; 1.
Could not he who gave ſight to the blind man, have even pre-
38 vented this man's death? *Jeſus therefore again groaning, came to the monument. It was a cave, the entrance whereof was ſhut up*
39 *with a ſtone. Jeſus ſaid*, Remove the ſtone. *Martha, the ſiſter of the deceaſed, anſwered*, Sir, by this time the ſmell is offen-
40 ſive, for this is the fourth day. *Jeſus replied*, Said I not unto thee, 'If thou believe, thou ſhalt ſee the glory of God?' *Then*
41 *they removed the ſtone. And Jeſus lifting up his eyes, ſaid*, Father,
42 I thank thee that thou haſt heard me. As for me, I know that thou heareſt me always; but I ſpeak for the people's ſake who ſurround me, that they may believe that thou haſt ſent me.
43 *After theſe words, raiſing his voice, he cried*, Lazarus, come forth.

And

(s) *Thomas* in Chaldee, and (t) *Didymus* in Greek, both ſignify *twin*.
(u) Near two miles.

44 *And he who had been dead came forth, bound hand and foot with fillets, and his face wrapped in a handkerchief. Jesus said to*
45 *them,* Unbind him, and let him go. *Many therefore of the Jews who had come to Mary, and seen what Jesus did, believed on him.*
46 *But some of them repaired to the pharisees, and told them what Jesus had done.*
47 *Whereupon the chief priests and the pharisees assembled the sanhedrim, and said,* What are we doing? for this man worketh
48 many miracles. If we let him go on thus, every body will believe on him, and the Romans will come and destroy both our place
ch. 18; 14. 49 and nation. *One of them, named Caiaphas, who was high priest that*
50 *year said to them.* Ye are utterly at a loss, and do not consider, that it is better for us that one man die for the people, than that the
51 whole nation be ruined. *This he spake, not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation;*
52 *and not for that nation only, but that he should assemble, into one body,*
53 *the dispersed children of God. From that day, therefore, they concerted*
54 *how they might destroy him. For this reason Jesus appeared no longer publicly among the Jews, but retired to the country, near the desert, to a city called Ephraim, and continued there with his disciples.*
55 *Meantime the Jewish passover approached, and many went to Jerusalem from the country, before the passover, to purify themselves. These*
56 *inquired after Jesus, and said one to another, as they stood in the temple,*
57 What think ye? Will he not come to the festival? *Now the chief priests and the pharisees had issued an order that whosoever knew where he was, should discover it, that they might apprehend him.*

Mat. 26; 6. Mar. 14; 3. ch. 11; 2. XII. *SIX days before the passover Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom he had raised from the dead. There they made him a*
2 *supper, and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of those who were*
3 *at table with him. Then Mary taking a pound of the balsam of spikenard, which was very valuable, anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped them with her hair, so that the house was filled with the odour of the*
4 *balsam. Whereupon one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son,*
5 *who was to betray him, said,* Why was not this balsam sold for three hundred denarii (*x*), which might have been given to the poor?
6 *This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief,*
7 *and had the purse, and carried what was put therein. Then Jesus said,* Let her alone. She hath reserved this to embalm me against the day
8 of my burial. For ye will always have the poor amongst you; but me ye will not always have.
9 *A great number of the Jews, knowing where he was, flocked thither, not on account of Jesus only, but likewise to see Lazarus*

(*x*) Above 9l. sterling.

10 *whom he had raiſed from the dead. The chief prieſts therefore*
11 *determined to kill Lazarus alſo; becauſe he proved the occaſion that many Jews forſook them, and believed on Jeſus.*

SECTION IX.

The Entry into Jeruſalem.

12 *ON the morrow a great multitude who were come to the feſtival,* Mat. 21; 6. Mar. 11; 7.
13 *hearing that Jeſus was on the road to Jeruſalem, took branches of palm-trees, and went to meet him, crying,* Hoſannah *(y)*, Lu. 19; 35.
bleſſed be Iſrael's King who cometh in the name of the Lord *(z)*.
14 *Now Jeſus having found a young aſs, was riding thereon, agreeably*
15 *to what is written, "Fear not, daughter of Zion; behold thy* Zec. 9; 9.
16 *King cometh, ſitting on an aſs's colt." Theſe things the diſciples did not underſtand at firſt; but after Jeſus was glorified, they remembered that thus it had been written concerning him, and that thus they*
17 *had done unto him. And the people who had been preſent atteſted that he called Lazarus out of the tomb, and raiſed him from the dead.*
18 *It was the rumour that he had wrought this miracle, which made the*
19 *people crowd to meet him. The phariſees therefore ſaid among themſelves,* Are ye not ſenſible that ye have no influence? Behold the world is gone after him.
20 *Now among thoſe who came to worſhip at the feſtival, there were*
21 *ſome Greeks. Theſe applied to Philip of Bethſaida in Galilee, making*
22 *this requeſt,* Sir we wiſh to ſee Jeſus. *Philip went and told Andrew: then Andrew and Philip told Jeſus.*
23 *Jeſus anſwered them, ſaying,* The time is come when the Son of
24 Man muſt be glorified. Verily verily I ſay unto you, when a grain of wheat is thrown into the ground, unleſs it die, it remaineth
25 ſingle; but if it die, it becometh very fruitful. He who loveth his Mat. 10; 39. & 26; 25. Mar. 8; 35. Lu 9; 24. & 17; 33.
life, ſhall loſe it; and he who hateth his life in this world, ſhall pre-
26 ſerve it eternally in the next. Would any man ſerve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there ſhall my ſervant alſo be. If any man ſerve me, my Father will reward him.
27 Now is my ſoul troubled, and what ſhall I ſay? [Shall I ſay] 'Father, ſave me from this hour?' But I came on purpoſe for
28 this hour. Father, glorify thy name. *Then came a voice from heaven, which ſaid,* I have both glorified, and will again glorify it.
29 *The people preſent heard the ſound, and ſaid,* It thundered: *others*
30 *ſaid,* An angel ſpake to him. *Jeſus ſaid,* This voice came not for my

(y) Save now I pray. *(z)* Jehovah.

31 my ſake, but for yours. Now muſt this world be judged. Now
32 muſt the prince of this world be caſt out. As for me, when I ſhall
33 be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men to myſelf. *This*
Pſ. 110; 4. Ezek. 37; 25. 34 *he ſaid alluding to the death which he was to ſuffer. The people anſwered*, We have learnt from the law that the Meſſiah will live forever. How ſayeſt thou then, that the Son of Man muſt be
35 lifted up? Who is this the Son of Man? *Jeſus ſaid to them*, Yet a little while the light continueth with you; walk, while ye have it, leſt darkneſs overtake you: for he that walketh in darkneſs
36 knoweth not whither he goeth. Confide in the light, while ye enjoy it, that ye may be the ſons of light. *Having ſpoken theſe words, he withdrew himſelf privately from them.*

37 *But though he had performed ſo many miracles before them, they*
Iſ. 53; 1. 38 *believed not on him; ſo that the word of the Prophet Iſaiah was*
Ro. 10; 16. *verified, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" and "To whom is*
39 *"the arm of the Lord (a) diſcovered?" For this reaſon they could*
Iſ. 6; 9. 40 *not believe; Iſaiah having ſaid alſo, "He hath blinded their eyes and*
Mat. 13; 14. Mar. 4; 12. Lu. 8; 10. *"blunted their underſtanding, that they might not ſee with their eyes,*
"comprehend with their underſtanding, and repent, that I might reclaim
Acts, 28; 26. Ro. 11; 8. 41 *"them." Theſe things ſaid Iſaiah, when he ſaw his glory and ſpake*
42 *concerning him. Nevertheleſs there were ſeveral even of the magiſtrates who believed on him, but, for fear of the phariſees, did not*
ch. 5; 44. 43 *avow it, leſt they ſhould be expelled the ſynagogue: for they preferred the approbation of men to the approbation of God.*

44 *Then Jeſus raiſing his voice, ſaid*, He who believeth on me, it is
45 not on me he believeth, but on him who ſent me. And he who
ch. 1; 4. 46 beholdeth me, beholdeth him who ſent me. I am come a light into the world, that whoſoever believeth on me, may not remain in
47 darkneſs. And if any man hear my words, but do not obſerve them; it is not I who condemn him; for I came, not to condemn
ch. 9; 17. Mar. 16; 16. 48 the world, but to ſave the world. He who deſpiſeth me and rejecteth my inſtructions, hath what condemneth him. The doctrine which I have taught will condemn him at the laſt day.
49 For I have not ſaid any thing from myſelf; but the Father who ſent me, hath commanded me, what I ſhould enjoin, and what I ſhould
50 teach. And I know that his commandment is eternal life. Whatever therefore I ſay, I ſpeak as the Father hath given me in charge.

Mat. 26; 2. Mar 14; 1. Lu. 22; 1. XIII. *JESUS having, before the feaſt of the paſſover, perceived that his time to remove out of this world to his Father was come, and having loved his own who were in the world, loved them to the laſt.*
2 *Now while they were at ſupper (the devil having already put it into the*

(a) Jehovah.

3 *the heart of Judas Iſcariot, Simon's ſon to betray him), Jeſus, though*
he knew that the Father had ſubjected every thing to him, and that he
4 *came from God, and was returning to God, aroſe from ſupper, and*
5 *laying aſide his mantle, girt himſelf about with a towel. Then he*
poured water into the baſon, and began to waſh the feet of the diſ-
ciples, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was
girded.
6 *When he came to Simon Peter, Peter ſaid to him,* Maſter,
7 wouldſt thou waſh my feet? *Jeſus anſwered,* At preſent thou doſt
not comprehend what I am doing; but thou ſhalt know hereafter.
8 *Peter replied,* Thou ſhalt never waſh my feet. *Jeſus anſwered,*
9 Unleſs I waſh thee, thou canſt have no part with me. *Simon Peter*
ſaid to him, Maſter, not my feet only then, but alſo my hands and
10 my head. *Jeſus replied,* He who hath been bathing, needeth
only to waſh his feet; the reſt of his body being clean. Ye are
11 clean, but not all. *For he knew who would betray him; therefore*
he ſaid, ye are not all clean.
12 *After he had waſhed their feet, he put on his mantle, and replacing*
himſelf at the table, ſaid to them, Do ye underſtand what I have
13 been doing to you? Ye call me the Teacher, and the Maſter; and
14 ye ſay right; for ſo I am. If I then, the Maſter and the Teacher,
have waſhed your feet, ye alſo ought to waſh one another's feet.
15 For I have given you an example that ye ſhould do as I have done
16 unto you. Verily verily I ſay unto you, the ſervant is not greater Mat. 10; 24.
than his maſter, nor the apoſtle greater than he who ſendeth Lu. 6; 40.
17 him. Happy are ye who know theſe things, provided ye practiſe ch. 15; 20.
them.
18 I ſpeak not of you all. I know whom I have choſen; but
that Scripture muſt be fulfilled, "He that eateth at my table hath Pſ. 41; 9.
19 "lifted his heel againſt me." I tell you this now before it happen,
20 that when it happeneth, ye may believe that I am the perſon. Verily Mat. 10; 40.
verily I ſay unto you, He that receiveth whomſoever I ſend, Lu. 10; 16.
receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him who ſent
me.
21 *After uttering theſe words Jeſus was troubled in ſpirit, and de-*
clared, ſaying, Verily verily I ſay unto you, that one of you will Mat. 26; 21.
22 betray me. *Then the diſciples looked one upon another, doubting of* Mar. 14; 18.
23 *whom he ſpake. Now one of his diſciples, one whom Jeſus loved,* Lu. 22; 21.
24 *was lying cloſe to his breaſt: Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him*
25 *to enquire whom he meant. He then reclining on Jeſus' boſom, ſaid*
26 *to him,* Maſter, who is it? *Jeſus anſwered,* It is he to whom I ſhall
gave this morſel, after I have dipped it. *And having dipped the*
27 *morſel, he gave it to Judas Iſcariot, Simon's Son. After receiving*
the morſel Satan entered into him. Then Jeſus ſaid to him, Wh t
thou

28 thou doſt, do quickly. *But none at the table knew why he gave him*
29 *this order. Some imagined becauſe Judas had the purſe, that Jeſus*
had ſignified to him to buy neceſſaries for the feſtival, or to give
30 *ſomething to the poor. When Judas had taken the morſel, he imme-*
diately went out: and it was night.

31 *When he was gone, Jeſus ſaid,* The Son of Man is now glorified,
32 and God is glorified by him. If God be glorified by him, God alſo
33 will glorify him by himſelf, and that without delay. My children,
I have now but a little time to be with you. Ye will ſeek me; and
ch. 7; 34. ch. 15; 12. 17. what I ſaid to the Jews, "Whither I go, ye cannot come," I ſay
34 at preſent to you. A new commandment I give you, that ye love
Eph. 5; 2. one another; that, as I have loved you, ye alſo love one another.
35 By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples, if ye have love
one to another.

36 *Simon Peter ſaid to him,* Maſter, whither art thou going? *Jeſus*
anſwered him, Whither I am going, thou canſt not follow me now,
37 but afterwards thou ſhalt follow me. *Peter replied,* Maſter, why
cannot I follow thee preſently? I will lay down my life for thy ſake.
Mat. 26; 34. Mar. 14; 30. Lu. 22; 33. 38 *Jeſus anſwered him,* Wilt thou lay down thy life for my ſake? Verily
verily I ſay unto thee, the cock ſhall not crow, until thou haſt
diſowned me thrice.

SECTION X.

Conſolation to the Diſciples.

XIV. LET not your heart be troubled; believe on God and be-
2 lieve on me. In my Father's houſe are many manſions. If
it were otherwiſe, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for
3 you: and after I ſhall have gone and prepared a place for you; I
will return and take you with me, that where I am, ye alſo may
4 be. And whither I am going ye know, and the way ye know.
5 *Thomas ſaid to him,* Maſter, we know not whither thou art going.
6 How then can we know the way? *Jeſus anſwered,* I am the way,
and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by
7 me. Had ye known me, ye would have known my Father alſo;
and henceforth ye know him, and have ſeen him.
8 *Philip ſaid unto him.* Maſter, ſhow us the Father, and it ſufficeth
9 us. *Jeſus replied,* Have I been with you ſo long, and doſt thou
not yet know me, Philip? He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the
10 Father. How ſayeſt thou then, "Show us the Father?" Doſt thou
not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me? The
words which I ſpeak to you proceed not from myſelf: as to the works,

11 it is the Father dwelling in me who doth them. Believe that I
am in the Father, and the Father is in me; if not on my teſtimony,
12 be convinced by the works themſelves. Verily verily I ſay unto
you, He who believeth on me, ſhall himſelf do ſuch works as I
do; nay even greater than theſe he ſhall do; becauſe I go to
13 my Father, and will do whatſoever ye ſhall aſk in my name. Mat. 7; 7.
14 That the Father may be glorified in the Son, whatſoever ye ſhall aſk & 21; 22. Mar. 11; 23. ch. 16; 23.
in my name, I will do.
15 If ye love me, keep my commandments; and I will entreat the
Father, and he will give you another Monitor to continue with you
17 for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive,
becauſe it neither ſeeth him, nor knoweth him; but ye ſhall
18 know him, becauſe he will abide with you and be in you. I will
19 not leave you orphans; I will return unto you. Yet a little while,
and the world ſhall ſee me no more; but ye ſhall ſee me; becauſe I
20 ſhall live, ye alſo ſhall live. On that day ye ſhall know that I am
21 in my Father, and ye are in me, and I am in you. He that hath
my commandments and keepeth them, he it is who loveth me; and
he who loveth me will be loved of my Father, and I will love him,
22 and diſcover myſelf unto him. *Judas (not Iſcariot) ſaid to him*,
Maſter, wherefore wilt thou diſcover thyſelf to us, and not unto
23 the world? *Jeſus anſwering, ſaid unto him*, If a man love me, he will
obſerve my word; and my Father will love him; and we will
come to him and dwell with him. He who loveth me not,
24 diſregardeth my words; yet the word which ye hear is not mine,
but the Father's who ſent me.
25 I tell you theſe things while I remain with you. But the Moni-
tor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will ſend in my name; he will
27 teach you all things, and remind you of all that I have told you. Peace
I leave you, my peace I give you; not as the world giveth, do I
28 give unto you. Be not diſheartened, be not intimidated. Ye
have heard me ſay, 'I go away and will return to you.' If ye loved
me, ye would rejoice that I go to the Father; becauſe my Father is
29 greater than I. This I tell you now before it happen, that when it
30 happeneth, ye may believe. I ſhall not henceforth have much
converſation with you; for the prince of the world is coming,
31 though he will find nothing in me; but this muſt be, that the world
may know that I love the Father and do whatſoever he commandeth
me. Ariſe, let us go hence.

XV. I AM the true vine, and my Father is the vinedreſſer.
2 Every barren branch in me he loppeth off: every fruitful branch
3 he cleaneth by pruning, to render it more fruitful. As for you, ye ch. 13; 10.
are already clean by means of the inſtructions I have given you.

4 Abide in me, and I will abide in you: as the branch cannot bear
fruit of itſelf, unleſs it adhere to the vine; no more can ye, unleſs ye
5 adhere to me. I am the vine; ye are the branches. He who
abideth in me, and in whom I abide, produceth much fruit: for
6 ſevered from me ye can do nothing. If any man adhere not to me,
he is caſt forth like the branch which is withered. Such branches
7 are gathered for fewel and burnt. If ye abide by me, and my
words abide in you, ye may aſk what ye will, and it ſhall be granted
you.
8 Herein is my Father glorified, that ye produce much fruit; ſo
9 ſhall ye be my diſciples. As the Father hath loved me, ſo have
10 I loved you: continue in my love. If ye keep my commandments,
ye ſhall continue in my love; as I have kept my Father's command-
11 ments and continue in his love. I have given you theſe admonitions,
that I may continue to have joy in you, and that your joy may
ch. 13; 34. 12 be complete: this is my commandment, that ye love one another,
Eph. 5; 2. 13 as I have loved you. Greater love hath not any man than this, to
1 Th. 4; 9. 14 lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatever
15 I command you. Henceforth I call not you ſervants; for the
ſervant knoweth not what his maſter will do; but I have named
you friends: for whatever I have learnt from my Father, I have
Mar. 3; 13. 16 imparted unto you. It is not you who have choſen me; but it is
Lu. 6; 13. I who have choſen you, and ordained you to go and bear fruit,
fruit which will prove permanent, that the Father may give you
whatſoever ye ſhall aſk him in my name.
1 Jo. 3; 11. 17 This I command you, that ye love one another. If the world
& 4; 7. 19 hate you, conſider that it hated me before it hated you. If ye
were of the world, the world would love its own. But becauſe
ye are not of the world, I have ſelected you from the world, the world
Mat. 10; 24. 20 hateth you. Remember what I ſaid to you, 'The ſervant is not
Lu. 6; 40. 'greater than his maſter.' If they have perſecuted me, they will
ch. 13; 16. alſo perſecute you; if they have obſerved my word, they will alſo ob-
21 ſerve yours. But all this treatment they will give you, on my ac-
22 count, becauſe they know not him who ſent me. If I had not come
and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin; but now they have no
23 excuſe for their ſin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father alſo. If I
24 had not done among them ſuch works as none other ever did, they
had not had ſin; but now they have ſeen them, and yet hated
Pſ. 35; 19. 25 both me and my Father. Thus they verify that paſſage in their
Lu. 24; 49. 26 law, "They hated me without cauſe." But when the Monitor is
come whom I will ſend you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth
27 who proceedeth from the Father, he will teſtify concerning me. And
ye alſo will teſtify, becauſe ye have been with me from the be-
ginning.

Theſe

XVI. These things I tell you, that ye may not be ensnared. They will
expel you the synagogue; nay, the time is coming when whosoever
3 killeth you, will think he offereth sacrifice to God. And these things
4 they will do because they know not the Father nor me. These
things I now warn you of, that when the time shall come, ye may
remember that I mentioned them to you. I did not indeed men-
tion them at the beginning, because I was with you myself.
5 And now that I go to him who sent me, none of you asketh me,
6 'Whither goest thou?' But because of those things which I have
foretold you, ye are overwhelmed with grief.
7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is for your good that I de-
part; for if I do not depart, the Monitor will not come to you; but
8 if I go away, I will send him to you. And when he is come, he will
convince the world concerning sin, and concerning righteousness, and
9 concerning judgment: concerning sin, because they believe not on
10 me; concerning righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye
11 see me no longer; concerning judgment, because the prince of this
world is judged.
12 I have many things still to tell you, but ye cannot yet bear
13 them. But when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will conduct you
into all the truth: for his words will not proceed from himself;
but whatsoever he shall have heard, he will speak, and show
14 you things to come. He will glorify me: for he will receive
15 of mine what he shall communicate to you. Whatsoever is the
Father's is mine; therefore I say that he will receive of mine to
communicate to you.
16 Within a little while ye shall not see me; a little while after ye
17 shall see me; because I go to the Father. *Some of his disciples
said among themselves*, What meaneth he by this, "Within a little
"while ye shall not see me; a little while after ye shall see me; because
18 "I go to the Father?" What meaneth this little while of which he
19 speaketh? We do not comprehend it. *Jesus perceiving that they
were desirous to ask him, said to them*, Do ye inquire amongst your-
selves about this that I said, "Within a little while ye shall not
20 "see me; a little while after ye shall see me?" Verily verily I say
unto you, ye will weep and lament, but the world will rejoice:
ye will be sorrowful; but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.
21 A woman in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come. But
when her son is born, she remembereth her anguish no longer,
22 for joy that she hath brought a man into the world. So ye at pre-
sent are in grief; but I will visit you again, and your hearts shall
23 be joyful, and none shall rob you of your joy. On that day ye
will put no questions to me. Verily verily I say unto you, what- ch. 14; 15.
24 soever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give you. Hither-

to

to ye have aſked nothing in my name; aſk and ye ſhall receive, that your joy may be complete.

25 Theſe things I have ſpoken to you in figures: the time approacheth when I ſhall no more diſcourſe to you in figures, but in-
26 ſtruct you plainly concerning the Father. Then ye will aſk in my
27 name, and I ſay not that I will entreat the Father for you: for the Father himſelf loveth you, becauſe ye love me and believe that I
28 came from God. From the preſence of the Father I came into the
29 world. Again I leave the world and return to the Father. *His diſciples replied*, Now indeed thou ſpeakeſt plainly, and without a
30 figure. Now we are convinced that thou knoweſt all things, and needeſt not that any ſhould put queſtions to thee. By this we be-
Mat. 26; 31. 31 lieve that thou cameſt forth from God. *Jeſus anſwered them*, Do
Mar. 14; 27. 32 ye now believe? Behold the time cometh, or rather is come, when ye ſhall diſperſe, every one to his own, and ſhall leave me alone;
33 yet I am not alone, becauſe the Father is with me. Theſe things I have ſpoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye ſhall have tribulation. But take courage; I have overcome the world.

XVII. *WHEN Jeſus had ended this diſcourſe, he ſaid, lifting up his eyes to heaven*, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son alſo
Mat. 28; 18. 2 may glorify thee; that being endowed by thee with authority over all men, he may beſtow eternal life on all thoſe whom thou haſt given
3 him. Now this is the life eternal, to know thee the only true God,
4 and Jeſus the Meſſiah thy apoſtle. I have glorified thee upon the earth; I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to do.
5 And now, Father, glorify thou me in thine own preſence with that glory which I enjoyed with thee before the world was.
6 I have made known thy name to the men whom thou haſt given me out of the world. They were thine; and thou gaveſt them me;
7 and they have kept thy word. Whatſoever thou haſt given me,
8 they now know to have come from thee; and that thou haſt imparted unto me the doctrine which I have imparted unto them.
ch. 16; 27. They have received it [as ſuch], knowing for certain, that I came
9 forth from thee, and am commiſſioned by thee. It is for them that I pray. I pray not for the world, but for thoſe whom thou haſt
10 given me, becauſe they are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine
11 mine, and am glorified in them. I continue no longer in the world; but theſe continue in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, preſerve them in thy name which thou haſt given me, that they
12 may be one as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; thoſe whom thou haſt given me I have
(ch. 18; 9.) preſerved. None of them is loſt except the ſon of perdition, as the

13 Scripture foretold. But now that I am coming to thee, I ſpeak theſe
14 things in the world, that their joy in me may be complete. I have
delivered thy word to them, and the world hateth them, becauſe they
15 are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I do not pray
thee to remove them out of the world, but to preſerve them from
16 evil. Of the world they are not, as I am not of the world.
17 Conſecrate them by the truth; thy word is the truth. As thou
haſt made me thy apoſtle to the world, I have made them my
19 apoſtles to the world. And I conſecrate myſelf for them, that they
may be conſecrated through the truth.
20 Nor do I pray for theſe alone, but for thoſe alſo who ſhall believe
21 on me through their teaching; that all may be one; that as thou
Father art in me, and I am in thee, they alſo may be one in us, that
22 the world may believe that thou haſt ſent me; and that I have given
them the glory which thou gaveſt me, that they may be one as we
23 are one; I in them, and thou in me, that their union may be per-
fected, and that the world may know that thou haſt ſent me,
24 and that thou loveſt them, as thou loveſt me. Father, I ch. 12; 26.
would that where I ſhall be, thoſe whom thou haſt given me may
be with me, that they may behold my glory which thou haſt
given me, becauſe thou lovedſt me before the formation of the
25 world. Righteous Father, though the world knoweth not thee, I
26 know thee; and theſe know that I have thy commiſſion. And to
them I have communicated, and will communicate, thy name,
that I being in them, they may ſhare in the love wherewith
thou loveſt me.

SECTION XI.

The Crucifixion.

XVIII. *WHEN Jeſus had ſpoken theſe words, he paſſed with*
his diſciples over the brook Kidron, where was a garden,
2 *into which he entered and his diſciples. Now Judas who betrayed*
him knew the place, becauſe Jeſus often reſorted thither with his
3 *diſciples. Then Judas having gotten the cohort (b), and officers from* Mat. 26; 47.
the chief prieſts and the phariſees, came thither with lanterns and Mar. 14; 43.
4 *torches, and arms. But Jeſus, who knew all that was coming* Lu. 22; 47.
5 *upon him, went forth and ſaid to them,* Whom ſeek you? *They*
anſwered him, Jeſus the Nazarene. *Jeſus replied,* I am he. *Now*
6 *Judas who betrayed him was with them. He had no ſooner ſaid to*

 them

(b) A Roman troop of ſoldiers, containing about five hundred.

them "I am he," than they going backwards fell to the ground.
7 He therefore asked them again, Whom seek ye? They said, Jesus
8 the Nazarene. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he. If,
ch. 17; 12. 9 therefore, ye seek me, let these go away. Thus was that which
he had spoken verified, "of those whom thou gavest me I have lost
10 "none." Then Simon Peter, who had a sword, drew it, and
smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. Now the
11 servant's name was Malchus. Jesus then said to Peter, Put up the
sword into the scabbard. Shall I not drink the cup which the
Father hath given me?
12 Then the cohort and their commander, and the Jewish officers,
13 apprehended Jesus, and having bound him, brought him first to
Annas, because he was father-in-law to Caiaphas who was high
ch. 11; 50. 14 priest that year. Now it was Caiaphas who had said in council to
the Jews, "It is expedient that one man die for the people."
Mat. 26; 58. 15 Meantime Simon Peter and another disciple followed Jesus. That
Mar. 14; 54. disciple being known to the high priest, entered his court-yard with
Lu. 22; 54. 16 Jesus. But Peter stood without at the door. Therefore the other
disciple who was known to the high priest, went out and spoke to
17 the portress, and brought in Peter. Then this maid the portress,
said to Peter, Art not thou also one of this man's disciples? He
18 answered, I am not. Now the servants and the officers stood near a
fire which they had made, because it was cold, and warmed themselves.
And Peter was standing with them and warming himself.
19 Then the high priest interrogated Jesus concerning his disciples and
20 his doctrine. Jesus answered, I spake openly to the world; I
always taught in the synagogues and in the temple, whither the
21 Jews constantly resort. I said nothing in secret. Why examinest
thou me? Examine them who heard me teach. They know
22 what I said. When he had spoken thus, one of the officers who attended,
gave him a blow and said, Answerest thou thus the high priest?
23 Jesus replied, If I have spoken amiss, show wherein it is amiss;
Mat. 26; 57. 24 if well, why smitest thou me? Now Annas had sent him bound to
Mar. 14; 53. Caiaphas the high priest.
Mat. 26; 69. 25 As Peter stood warming himself, they asked him, Art not thou also
Mar. 14; 67. 26 one of his disciples? He denied it and said, I am not. One of the
Lu. 22; 55. servants of the high priest, a kinsman to him, whose ear Peter had cut
27 off, said, Did not I see thee in the garden with him? Peter denied
again, and immediately the cock crew.
Mat. 27; 1. 28 THEN they led Jesus from the house of Caiaphas to the preto-
Mar 15; 1. rium (c): it was now morning; but the Jews entered not the preto-
Lu. 23; 1. rium, (c) lest they should be defiled, and so not in a condition to eat the
Acts, 10; 28. & 11; 3. passover.

(c) Procurator's palace, or hall of audience.

29 *paſſover. Pilate, therefore, went out to them and ſaid,* Of what do
30 ye accuſe this man? *They anſwered,* If he were not a criminal,
31 we would not have delivered him to thee. *Pilate, therefore, ſaid,* Take him yourſelves then, and, judge him according to your law. *The Jews replied,* We are not permitted to put any man to death.
32 *And thus what Jeſus had ſpoken, ſignifying what death he ſhould die,* Mat. 20; 19.
was accompliſhed.

33 *Then Pilate returned to the pretorium and having called Jeſus,* Mat. 27; 11.
34 *ſaid to him,* Thou art the king of the Jews? *Jeſus anſwered,* Sayeſt Mar. 15; 2.
thou this of thyſelf; or did others tell thee ſo concerning me? Lu. 23; 3.
35 *Pilate replied,* Am I Jew? Thine own nation, yea the chief prieſts
36 have delivered thee to me. What haſt thou done? *Jeſus anſwered,* My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my adherents would have fought to prevent my falling into the hands of the Jews; but my kingdom is not hence.
37 *Pilate thereupon ſaid,* Thou art king then? *Jeſus anſwered,* Thou ſayeſt that I am king. For this I was born; and for this I
38 came into the world, to give teſtimony to the truth. Whoſoever is of the truth, hearkeneth to me. *Pilate aſked him,* What is truth? *and ſo ſaying, went out again to the Jews, and ſaid to them,* For my part I find nothing culpable in this man.
39 But ſince it is cuſtomary that I releaſe to you one at the paſſ- Mat. 27; 15.
40 over, will ye that I releaſe to you the king of the Jews? *Then they* Mar. 15; 6.
all cried, ſaying, Not this man but Barabbas. *Now Barabbas was* Lu. 23; 17.
a robber. Acts, 3; 14.

XIX. *Then Pilate cauſed him to be ſcourged. And the ſoldiers crowned* Mat. 27; 27.
him with a wreath of thorn which they had plated; and having thrown Mar. 15; 15.
3 *a purple mantle about him, ſaid,* Hail! king of the Jews, *and gave*
4 *him blows on the face. Pilate, therefore, went out again and ſaid to them,* Lo, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find
5 in him nothing culpable. *Jeſus then went forth wearing the crown of thorns and the purple mantle; and Pilate ſaid to them,* Behold the
6 man! *When the chief prieſts and the officers ſaw him, they cried, ſaying,* Crucify, crucify him. *Pilate ſaid to them,* Take him yourſelves and
7 crucify him; as for me, I find no fault in him. *The Jews anſwered,* We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, becauſe he aſſumed the title of Son of God.
8. *When Pilate heard this, he was the more afraid, and having re-*
turned to the pretorium, ſaid to Jeſus, Whence art thou? *But*
10 *Jeſus gave him no anſwer. Then Pilate ſaid to him,* Wilt thou not ſpeak unto me? Knoweſt thou not that I have power to crucify thee,

11 thee, and power to releaſe thee? *Jeſus replied*, Thou couldſt have
no power over me, unleſs it were given thee from above, wherefore
12 he who delivered me to thee hath the greater ſin. *Thenceforth
Pilate ſought to releaſe him; but the Jews exclaimed*, If thou releaſe
this man, thou art not Ceſar's friend. Whoſoever calleth himſelf
king, oppoſeth Ceſar.
13 *Pilate, on hearing theſe words, ordered Jeſus to be brought forth,
and ſat down on the tribunal in a place named the pavement, in Hebrew*
14 *Gabbatha (d). Now it was the preparation (e) of the paſchal
Sabbath, about the ſixth hour, (f.) And he ſaid to the Jews*,
15 Behold your king. *But they cried out*, Away, away with him,
crucify him. *Pilate ſaid to them*, Shall I crucify your king? *The*
16 *chief prieſts anſwered*, We have no king but Ceſar. *He delivered
him, threfore, to them to be crucified.*

Mat. 27; 33. Mar. 15; 22. Lu. 23; 33.
17 *Then they took Jeſus and led him away. And he carrying his
croſs, went out to a place called the place of ſculls (g), which is in*
18 *Hebrew Golgotha, where they crucified him and two others with him,*
19 *one on each ſide, and Jeſus in the middle. Pilate alſo wrote a title,
and put it upon the croſs. The words were, JESUS THE NAZA-*
20 *RENE, THE KING OF THE JEWS. And many of the Jews
read this title (for the place where Jeſus was crucified was nigh the*
21 *city; and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin); whereupon
the chief prieſts ſaid to Pilate*, Write not "the king of the Jews,"
22 but "who calleth himſelf king of the Jews." *Pilate anſwered*, What
I have written, I have written.

Mat. 27; 35. Mar. 15; 24. Lu. 23; 34.
23 *When the ſoldiers had nailed Jeſus to the croſs, they took his
mantle, and divided it into four parts, one to every ſoldier: they alſo
took the coat, which was ſeamleſs, woven from the top throughout,*
24 *and ſaid among themſelves*, Let us not tear it, but determine by lot
whoſe it ſhall be; *thereby verifying the Scripture which ſaith,*
Pſ. 22; 18. "*They ſhared my mantle among them, and caſt lots for my veſture.*"
Thus therefore acted the ſoldiers.
25 *Now there ſtood near the croſs of Jeſus, his mother, and her ſiſter*
26 *Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. Then Jeſus obſerv-
ing his mother, and the diſciple whom he loved ſtanding by, ſaid to*
27 *his mother*, Woman, behold thy ſon. *Then he ſaid to the diſciple*,
Behold thy mother. *And from that hour the diſciple took her to his
own home.*
28 *After this Jeſus knowing that all was now accompliſhed; that*
Pſ. 69; 21. 29 *the Scripture might be fulfilled, ſaid*, I thirſt. *As there was a veſſel
there full of vinegar, they filled a ſponge with vinegar, and, having*
30 *faſtened it to a twig of hyſſop, held it to his mouth. When Jeſus had*

 received

(d) *A raiſed place.* (e) *Friday.* (f) Twelve o'clock *noon.* (g) Vul. *Calvary.*

received the vinegar, he said, It is finished, *and bowing his head, yielded up his spirit.*

31 *The Jews, therefore, lest the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath (h), for it was the preparation (i) (and that Sabbath was a great day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and the*
32 *bodies might be removed. Accordingly the soldiers came and broke the*
33 *legs of the first, and of the other who were crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and found that he was already dead, they*
34 *did not break his legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced*
35 *his side, whence blood and water immediately issued. He was an eye-witness who attesteth this, and his testimony deserveth credit: nay, he*
36 *is conscious that he speaketh truth that ye may believe. For these things* Ex. 12; 46. Num. 9; 12.
happened that the Scripture might be verified, "None of his bones
37 *"shall be broken." Again, the Scripture saith elsewhere, "They "shall look on him whom they have pierced."* Zech. 12; 10.

SECTION XII.

The Resurrection.

38 *AFTER this Joseph the Arimathean, who was a disciple of Jesus, but a concealed disciple, for fear of the Jews, asked permission of* Mat. 27; 57. Mar. 15; 43. Lu. 23; 50. ch. 3; 1.
Pilate to take away the body of Jesus, which Pilate having granted, he
39 *went and took the body of Jesus. Nicodemus also, who had formerly repaired to Jesus by night, came and brought a mixture of myrrh and*
40 *aloes, weighing about a hundred pounds. These men took the body of Jesus and wound it in linen rollers with the spices, which is the*
41 *Jewish manner of embalming. Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden, a new monument*
42 *wherein no one had ever yet been laid. There they deposited Jesus on account of the Jewish preparation (i), the monument being near.*

XX. *THE first day of the week (k) Mary Magdalene went early to the monument, while it was yet dark, and saw that the stone had been* Mat. 28; 1. Mar. 16; 1. Lu. 24; 1.
2 *removed from the entrance. Then she came running to Simon Peter, and to that other disciple whom Jesus loved, and said to them,* They have taken the Master out of the monument, and we know not
3 where they have laid him. *Immediately Peter went out, and the other*
4 *disciple, to go to the monument. And both ran together, but the other dis-*
5 *ciple out-ran Peter, and came first to the monument; and stooping*

 down,

(h) Saturday. (i) Friday. (k) Sunday.

6 *down, he ſaw the linen rollers lying, but went not in. Then came*
Simon Peter, who followed him, and went into the monument, where
7 *he obſerved the rollers lying, and the handkerchief which had been*
wrapped about his head, not laid beſide them, but folded up in a place
8 *by itſelf. Then the other diſciple, who came firſt to the monument,*
9 *entered alſo; and he ſaw and believed* [*the report*]. *For as yet they*
did not underſtand from the Scriptures that he was to riſe from the
10 *dead. Then the diſciples returned to their companions.*
11 *But Mary ſtood without near the monument weeping. As ſhe*
12 *wept, ſtooping down to look into the monument, ſhe ſaw two angels in*
white, ſitting where the body of Jeſus had lain, one at the head, the
13 *other at the feet. And they ſaid to her,* Woman, why weepeſt
thou? *She anſwered,* Becauſe they have taken away my Maſter,
Mar. 16; 9. 14 and I know not where they have laid him. *Having ſaid this, ſhe*
turned about and ſaw Jeſus ſtanding, but knew not that it was
15 *Jeſus. Jeſus ſaid to her,* Woman, why weepeſt thou? whom
ſeekeſt thou? *She ſuppoſing him to be the gardener, anſwered,* Sir, if
thou have conveyed him hence, tell me where thou haſt laid
16 him, and I will take him away. *Jeſus ſaid to her,* Mary. *She*
17 *turning ſaid to him,* Rabboni, *that is, Doctor. Jeſus ſaid to her,* Lay
not hands on me; for I have not yet aſcended to my Father:
but go to my brethren, and ſay unto them, 'I aſcend to my
18 'Father and your Father, my God and your God.' *Mary Magda-*
lene went and informed the diſciples that ſhe had ſeen the Maſter, and
that he had ſpoken theſe things to her.
Mar. 16; 14. Lu. 24; 36. 19 *In the evening of that day, the firſt of the week (l), Jeſus came*
where the diſciples were convened (the doors having been ſhut for fear
of the Jews), and ſtood in the midſt, and ſaid to them, Peace be
20 unto you. *Having ſaid this, he ſhowed them his hands and his ſide.*
The diſciples, therefore, rejoiced when they ſaw it was their Maſter.
21 *Jeſus ſaid again to them,* Peace be unto you. As the Father hath
ſent me, ſo ſend I you. *After theſe words he breathed on them, and*
Mat. 18; 18. 23 *ſaid unto them,* Receive the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſe ſins ſoever ye
remit, are remitted to them; and whoſe ſins ſoever ye retain,
are retained.
24 *Now Thomas (m), that is Didymus (m), one of the twelve, was not*
25 *with them when Jeſus came. The other diſciples, therefore, ſaid to*
him, We have ſeen the Maſter. *But he anſwered,* Unleſs I ſee in
his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger to the
print of the nails, and my hand to his ſide, I will not believe.
26 *Eight days after, the diſciples being again in the houſe, and Thomas*
with them, Jeſus came, the doors having been ſhut, and ſtood in the
midſt

(l) Sunday. (m) See ch. 11; 16.

27 *midſt and ſaid*, Peace be unto you. *Then turning to Thomas*, Reach
hither thy finger, *he ſaid*, and look at my hands; reach alſo thy
28 hand and feel my ſide, and be not incredulous, but believe. *And*
29 *Thomas anſwered, and ſaid unto him*, My Lord and my God. *Jeſus replied*, Becauſe thou ſeeſt me, Thomas, thou believeſt: happy they who, having never ſeen, ſhall nevertheleſs believe.

30 *Many other miracles Jeſus likewiſe performed in the preſence of his* ch. 21; 25.
31 *diſciples which are not recorded in this book. But theſe are recorded that ye may believe, that Jeſus is the Meſſiah the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life through his name.*

XXI. *AFTERWARDS Jeſus again appeared to the diſciples at the ſea*
a *of Tiberias, and in this manner he appeared. Simon Peter and Thomas* (*n*), *that is, Didymus* (*n*), *Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the*
3 *ſons of Zebedee, and two other diſciples of Jeſus being together, Simon Peter ſaid*, I go a-fiſhing. *They anſwered*, We will go with thee. *Immediately they went, and got aboard a bark, but that night caught*
4 *nothing. In the morning Jeſus ſtood on the ſhore; the diſciples,*
5 *however, knew not that it was Jeſus. Jeſus ſaid to them*, My lads,
6 have ye any victuals? *They anſwered*, No. Caſt the net, *cried he*, on the right ſide of the bark, and ye will find. *They did ſo, but were*
7 *not able to draw it, by reaſon of the multitude of fiſhes. Then that diſciple whom Jeſus loved, ſaid to Peter*, It is the Maſter. *Simon Peter hearing that it was the Maſter, girt on his upper garment (which he*
8 *had laid aſide) and threw himſelf into the ſea. But the other diſciples came in the boat (for they were not farther from land than about two*
9 *hundred cubits), dragging the net with the fiſhes. When they came*
10 *aſhore they ſaw a fire burning and fiſh laid thereon and bread. Jeſus ſaid to them*, Bring of the fiſhes which ye have now taken.
11 *Simon Peter went back and drew the net to land, full of large fiſhes, a hundred and fifty three; and the net was not rent, notwith-*
12 *ſtanding the number. Jeſus ſaid to them*, Come and dine. *Meantime none of the diſciples ventured to aſk him*, Who art thou?
13 *knowing that it was the Maſter. Jeſus then drew near, and taking*
14 *bread and fiſh, diſtributed among them. This is the third time that Jeſus appeared to his diſciples after his reſurrection.*

15 *When they had dined, Jeſus ſaid to Simon Peter*, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me more than theſe? *He anſwered*, Yes, Lord, thou knoweſt that I love thee. *Jeſus replied*, Feed my lambs.
16 *A ſecond time he ſaid*, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me? *He anſwered*, Yes, Lord, thou knoweſt that I love thee. *Jeſus replied*,
17 Tend my ſheep. *A third time he ſaid*, Simon ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou

(*n*) See ch. 11; 16.

thou me? *Peter grieved at his aſking this queſtion the third time, anſwered,* Lord, thou knoweſt all things, thou knoweſt that I love
2 Pet. 1; 14. 18 thee. *Jeſus replied,* Feed my ſheep. Verily verily I ſay unto thee, in thy youth thou girteſt thyſelf, and wenteſt whither thou wouldſt; but in thine old age, thou ſhalt ſtrech out thy hands; and another
19 will gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldſt not. *This he ſpake ſignifying by what death he ſhould glorify God. After theſe words he ſaid to him,* Follow me.
20 *And Peter turning about ſaw the diſciple whom Jeſus loved*
ch. 13; 23. *following, (the ſame who leaning on his breaſt at the ſupper, had aſked*
21 *who it was that would betray him). Peter ſeeing him, ſaid to Jeſus,*
22 And what, Lord, ſhall become of this man? *Jeſus anſwered,* If I will, that he wait my return, what is that to thee, follow thou me.
23 *Hence aroſe the rumour among the brethren, that that diſciple ſhould not die; nevertheleſs Jeſus ſaid not that he ſhould not die, but "if I "will, that he wait my return, what is that to thee?"*
24 *It is this diſciple who atteſteth theſe things and wrote this account;*
ch. 20; 30. 25 *and we know that his teſtimony deſerveth credit. There were many other things alſo performed by Jeſus, which, were they to be ſeverally related, I imagine the world itſelf could not contain the volumes that would be written. Amen.*

N O T E S

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IT is proper to obſerve that, in the following Notes, repetitions and unneceſſary references are, as much as poſſible, avoided. When an uſeful illuſtration of any word or phraſe is to be found in the Notes on one of the ſucceeding Goſpels, the place is commonly referred to; not ſo, when it is in one of the preceding, becauſe it may probably be remembered; and if it ſhould not, the margin of the text will direct to the places proper to be conſulted. But when the explanation of a term occurs in the Notes on a preceding Goſpel, in a paſſage not marked in the paſſage as parallel, the place is metioned in the Notes. In words which frequently recur, it has been judged convenient to adopt the following Abbreviations.

Al.	Alexandrian manuſcript
An.	Anoymous Eng. tranſlation in 1729
Ar.	Arias Montanus
Ara.	Arabic
Arm.	Armenian
Be.	Beza
Beau.	Beauſobre and Lenfant
Ben.	Bengelius
Cal.	Calvin
Cam.	Cambridge manuſcript
Caſ.	Caſtalio
Cha.	Chaldee
Chr.	Chryſoſtom
Com.	Complutenſian edition
Cop.	Coptic
Dio.	Diodati
Diſſ.	Diſſertation
Dod.	Doddridge
E. B.	Engliſh Bible—in common uſe
E. T.	Engliſh tranſlation—the ſame
Eng.	Engliſh
Er.	Eraſmus
Eth.	Ethiopic
Euth.	Euthymius
Fr.	French
G. E.	Geneva Engliſh
G. F.	Geneva French
Ger.	German
Go.	Gothic
Gr.	Greek
Gro.	Grotius
Ham.	Hammond
Heb.	Hebrew
Hey.	Heylyn
J.	John
Itc.	Italic
Itn.	Italian
L.	Luke
La.	Latin
Lu.	Luther
L. Cl.	Le Clerc
M. G.	Modern Greek
Mr.	Mark
MS.	Manuſcript
Mt.	Matthew
N. T.	New Teſtament
O. T.	Old Teſtament
P.	Part
P. R.	Port Royal tranſlation
Per.	Perſic
Piſc.	Piſcator
Rh.	Rhemiſh
Sa.	Saci
Sax.	Saxon
Sc.	Scott
Sep.	Septuagint
Si.	Simon
Sy.	Syriac
The.	Theophylact
Vat.	Vatican manuſcript
Vul.	Vulgate
Wa.	Wakefield
Wef.	Weſley
Wet.	Wetſtein
Wh.	Whitby
Wor.	Worſley
Wy.	Wynne
Zu.	Zuric tranſlation.

If there be a few more contractions not here ſpecified, they are ſuch only as are in pretty general uſe. In terms which occur ſeldomer, the words are given at length.

N O T E S

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MATTHEW.

THE TITLE.

THE title, neither of this nor of the other hiſtories of our Lord, is to be aſcribed to the penmen. But it is manifeſt, that the titles were prefixed in the earlieſt times, by thoſe who knew the perſons by whom, and the occaſions on which, theſe writings were compoſed. For the ſenſe wherein the word Goſpel is here uſed, ſee Prel. Diſſ. V. P. II. § 18.

1. Κατα Ματθαιον, *according to Matthew, of Matthew,* or *by Matthew.* Theſe are ſynonymous, as has been evinced from the beſt authorities. Caſ. rendered it *authore Matthæo,* properly enough. Nor is this, as Be. imagines, in the leaſt repugnant to the claim of the Evangeliſts to inſpiration. Paul does not heſitate to call the doctrine with which he was inſpired *his Goſpel.* Nor does any man at preſent ſcruple to call the Epiſtles written by that Apoſtle *Paul's Epiſtles.*

3. Το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον. I have preferred this to every other title, becauſe it is not only the brieſeſt and the ſimpleſt, but incomparably the oldeſt, and therefore the moſt reſpectable. All the ancient Gr. MSS. have it. The titles in the old La. verſion called Itc. were ſimply *Evangelium ſecundum Matthæum —ſecundum Marcum,* &c. and in the moſt ancient MSS. and even editions of the preſent Vul. they are the ſame. From the writing of the Fathers, both Gr. and La. it appears that the title was retained every where in the ſame ſimplicity, as far down as the fifth century. Afterwards, when, through a vitiated taſte, uſeleſs epithets came much in vogue, ſome could not endure the nakedneſs of ſo ſimple a title. It then became *Sanctum Jeſu Chriſti Evangelium ſecundum Mathæum,* &c. which is that uſed in the Vul. at preſent. The N. T. printed at Alcala (called the Complutenſian Polyglot) is the firſt Gr. edition wherein a deviation was made, in this reſpect, from the primitive ſimplicity. The title is there in conformity to the Vul. printed along with it, Το κατα Ματθαιον ἁγιον ευαγγελιον. This mode was adopted by ſome ſubſequent editors. Moſt of the tranſlators into modern languages have gone farther and prefixed the ſame epithet to the name of the writer. Thus Dio. in Itn. *Il ſanto evangelio,* &c. *ſecondo S. Matteo.* The tranſlators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. and L. Cl. in Fr. *Le ſaint evangile,* &c. *ſelon Saint Matthieu.* Our tranſlators after Lu. have not given the epithet to the Goſpel, but have added it to the writer. Yet they have not prefixed this term to the names even of the Apoſtles in the titles of their Epiſtles. In this I think they are ſingular. The learned Wet. in his excellent edition of the Gr. N. T. remarks that though the term correſponding to *Goſpel* occurs in that book upwards of ſeventy times, it is not once accompanied with the epithet *holy.*

CHAP. I.

1. *The lineage,* E. T. *The book of the generation.* Βιβλος γενεσεως. This phraſe, which correſponds to the Heb. ספר תולדות *ſepher tholdoth,* is ſuppoſed, by ſome, to be the title of the firſt ſeventeen verſes only; by others, of the whole book. The former in effect tranſlate it as I have done; the latter *The Hiſtory.* That in the firſt of theſe ſenſes, and alſo for an account of progeny, the Gr. phraſe is uſed by Helleniſt writers, is undeniable; it is not ſo clear that it is uſed in the ſecond, for a narrative of a man's life. It is true we ſometimes find it where it can mean neither genealogy nor liſt of deſcendants, as in that phraſe in the Sep. βιβλος γενεσεως ηραν και γης, Gen. ii. 4. the meaning of which is, doubtleſs, *the origin and gradual production of the univerſe,* which has plainly ſome analogy, though

a remote one, to an account of anceſtry. The quotations that have been produced on the other ſide, from the Pentateuch, Judith, and the Epiſtle of James, do not appear deciſive of the queſtion. Of ſtill leſs weight is the name *Sepher toledoth Jeſu*, given to paltry, modern, Jewiſh fictions, written in oppoſition to the Goſpel; though this alſo has been urged as an argument.

2. *Chriſt*, Χριστος, without the article is here to be underſtood, not as an appellative, as it is in almoſt all other places of the Goſpel, but as a proper name. Into this uſe it came ſoon after our Lord's reſurrection, but not before. Some diſtinction was neceſſary, as at that time the name *Jeſus* was common among the Jews. Diſſ. V. P. IV. § 7.

3. *Son*, υιος indefinitely, not το υιος *the ſon* emphatically. The ſenſe is rightly rendered by Caſ. *prognati Davide*, a deſcendant of David. There is a modeſty and ſimplicity in the manner in which the hiſtorian introduces his ſubject. He ſays no more than is neceſſary to make his readers diſtinguiſh the perſon of whom he ſpeaks, leaving them to form their judgment of his miſſion and character, from a candid but unadorned narration of the facts.

2. *Judah*, &c. My reaſon for preferring the O. T. orthography of proper names ye have Diſſ. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

6. *By her who had been wife of Uriah.* Εκ της του Ουριου. Literally, *By her of Uriah*, It is not juſt to ſay that the feminine article thus uſed denotes *the wife*. The relation is in this phraſe neither expreſſed, nor neceſſarily implied, but is left to be ſupplied from the readers knowledge of the ſubject. We have no idiom in Engliſh entirely ſimilar. That which comes neareſt is when we give the names, but ſuppreſs the relation, on account of its notoriety. Thus, if it were ſaid, that David had Solomon *by Uriah's Bathſheba*, every body would be ſenſible that the expreſſion does not neceſſarily imply that Bathſheba was *the wife*, more than *the widow*, *the daughter*, or even *the ſiſter of Uriah*. We have an inſtance in Mark xvi. 1. Μαρια η του Ιακωβου, where the void muſt be ſupplied by the word *mother*. The like holds of the maſculine. In Acts i. 13. Ιακωβος Αλφαιου, muſt be ſupplied by υιος, *ſon;* and in Luke vi. 16. Ιουδαν Ιακωβου, by αδελφον, *brother*. What therefore is really implied, in any particular caſe, can be learnt only from a previous acquaintance with the ſubject. Hence we diſcover that the eliſis in this place cannot be ſupplied by the word *wife*; for when Uriah was dead, he could not be a huſband. Thoſe therefore who render εκ της του Ουριου *of Uriah's wife*, charge the hiſtorian with a blunder of which he is not guilty, and miſlead careleſs readers into the notion that Solomon was begotten in adultery. The common verſion exhibits the ſenſe with ſufficient exactneſs

8. *Uzziah*, τον Οζιαν. So the Sep. renders this name in Gr. 2 Chr. xxvi. 4. Whereas *Ahaziah* is by them rendered Οχοζιας. Some names are omitted in the line, in whatever way it be rendered here; for though Ahaziah was indeed the Son of Joram, Uzziah was the father of Jotham.

11. Some copies read, *Joſiah begat Jehoiachin; Jehoiachin had Jeconiah*, &c. and this reading has been adopted into ſome editions. But there is no authority from ancient MSS. tranſlations, or commentaries, for this reading, which ſeems to have ſprung from ſome over-zealous tranſcriber, who, finding that there were only thirteen in either the ſecond ſeries or the third, has thought it neceſſary thus to ſupply the defect. For if Jehoiachin be reckoned in the ſecond ſeries, Jeconiah may be counted the firſt of the third, and then the whole will be complete. But as, in very early times, the fathers found the ſame difficulty in this paſſage which we do at preſent, there is the greateſt ground to ſuſpect the correction abovementioned.

11, 12. *About the time of the migration into Babylon. After the migration into Babylon,* επι της μετοικεσιας Βαβυλωνος. Μετα την μετοικεσιαν Βαβυλωνος. In the La. verſions, the word μετοικεσια is differently tranſlated. The Vul. Arias, and Leo de Juda, render it *tranſmigratio*, Be. *tranſportatio*, Piſc, *deportatio*, Er. Cal. and Caſ. *exilium*, Lu. in Ger. calls it **gefangniſs**, Dio in Itn. *cattivita*, Si. and L. Cl. in Fr. *tranſmigration*. G. F. P. R. Beau. and Sa. adopt a circumlocution, employing the verb *tranſporter*. The E. T. ſays, *about the time they were carried away to Babylon. After they were brought to Babylon.* In nearly the ſame way the words are rendered by Sc. Dod. renders them, *About the time of the Babyloniſh captivity. After the Babyloniſh captivity*. Wa. ſays, *the removal to Babylon*, It is evident, not only from the word employed by the ſacred hiſtorian, but alſo from the context, that he points to the act of removing into Babylon, and not to the termination of the ſtate wherein the people remained ſeventy years after their removal, as the event which concluded the ſecond epoch and began the third, mentioned in the 17th verſe. Whereas the La. *exilium*, Ger. **gefangniſs**, Itn. *cattiviti*, and Eng. *captivity*, expreſs the ſtate of the people during all that period, and by conſequence egregiouſly miſrepreſent the ſenſe. They make the author ſay what is not true, that certain perſons were begotten after, who were begotten during, the captivity. Further, it deſerves to be remarked that, as this Apoſtle wrote, in the opinion of all antiquity, chiefly for the converts from Judaiſm, he carefully avoided giving any unneceſſary offence to his countrymen. The terms *captivity*, *exile*, *tranſportation*, *ſubjection*, were offenſive, and, with whatever truth they might be applied, the Jews could not eaſily bear the application. A remarkable inſtance of their delicacy in this reſpect, the effect of national pride, we have in J. viii. 33. where they boldly aſſert their uninterrupted freedom and independency, in contradiction both to their own hiſtorians, and to their own experience at that very time. This humour had led them to expreſs ſome diſagreeable events, which they could not altogether diſſemble, by the

the ſofteſt names they could deviſe. Of this ſort is μετοικεσια, by which they expreſſed the moſt direful calamity that had ever befallen their nation. The word ſtrictly ſignifies no more than paſſing from one place or ſtate to another. It does not even convey to the mind whether the change was voluntary or forced. For this reaſon we muſt admit that Be. Piſc. Beau. Sa. and the E. T. have all departed, though not ſo far as Caſ. Lu. Dio. and Dod. from the more indefinite, and therefore more delicate expreſſion of the original, and even from that of the Vul. from which Sa.'s verſion is profeſſedly made. For the words uſed by all theſe imply compulſion. Nor let it be imagined that, becauſe μετοικεσια occurs frequently in the Sep. where the word in Hebrew ſignifies *captivity*, it is therefore to be underſtood as equivalent. That verſion was made for the uſe of Grecian or Helleniſt Jews, who lived in cities where Greek was the vulgar tongue; and as the tranſlation of the Scriptures into the language of the place expoſed their hiſtory to the natives, they were the more ſolicitous to ſoften, by a kind of euphemiſm, a circumſtance ſo humiliating as their miſerable enthralment to the Babylonians. For this reaſon, that event is, eſpecially in the hiſtorical part, rarely denominated αιχμαλωσια *captivitas*, and never διακομιδη *tranſportatio*, but by one or other of theſe gentler names, μετοικια, μετοικεσια, αποικια, and αποικεσια, *colonia, migratio, demigratio, incolatus*, ſeu *habitatio in terra aliena*. On the whole, the Vul. Si. L. Cl. and Wa. have hit the import of the original more exactly than any of the other tranſlators above mentioned. I did not think the term *tranſmigration* ſo proper in our language, that word being in a manner appropriated to the Oriental doctrine of the paſſage of the ſoul, after death, into another body. *Emigration* is at preſent, I imagine, more commonly uſed when the removal is voluntary. The ſimple term *migration* ſeems fully to expreſs the meaning of the original.

16. *Meſſiah*, χριστος. For the import of the word, ſee Diſſ. V. P. IV. § 9.

18. *Jeſus Chriſt*. The Vul. omits *Jeſu*, and is followed only by the Per. and Sax. verſions.

19. *Being a worthy man*, δικαιος ων. Some would have the word δικαιος, in this place, to ſignify *good-natured, humane, merciful*; becauſe, to procure the infliction of the puniſhment denounced by the law, cannot be deemed *unjuſt*, without impeaching the law. Others think that it ought to be rendered, according to its uſual ſignification, *juſt*; and imagine that it was the writer's intention to remark two qualities in Joſeph's character; firſt, his ſtrict *juſtice*, which would not permit him to live with an adultereſs as his wife; ſecondly, his *humanity*, which led him to ſtudy privacy in his method of diſſolving the marriage. Herein, ſay they, there can be no injuſtice; becauſe there are many things, both for compenſation and puniſhment, which the law entitles, but does not oblige, a man to exact. Though this interpretation is ſpecious, it is not ſatisfactory; for if the writer had intended to expreſs two diſtinct qualities in Joſeph's character, which drew him different ways, I think he would have expreſſed himſelf differently; as thus, *Though Joſeph was a juſt man, yet being unwilling*, &c. whereas the manner in which he has connected the clauſes, ſeems to make the latter explanatory of the former, rather than a contraſt to it. It has indeed been ſaid, that the participle ων ſometimes admits being interpreted *though*. In proof of this, Mt. vii. 11. and Gal. ii. 3. have been quoted. But the conſtruction is not ſimilar in either paſſage. Here the ων is coupled with another participle by the conjunction και. In the places referred to, it is immediately followed by a verb in the indicative. In ſuch caſes, to which the preſent has no reſemblance, the words connected may give the force of an adverſative to the participle. On the other hand, I have not ſeen ſufficient evidence for rendering δικαιος *humane* or *merciful*: for though theſe virtues be ſometimes comprehended under the term, they are not ſpecially indicated by it. I have therefore choſen a middle way, as more unexceptionable than either. Every body knows that the word δικαιος admits two ſenſes. The firſt is *juſt*, in the ſtricteſt acceptation, attentive to the rules of equity in our dealings, particularly in what concerns property and judicial proceedings. The ſecond is *righteous* in the moſt extenſive ſenſe, including every eſſential part of a good character. In this ſenſe it is equivalent, as Chr. remarks, to the epithet αγαθος, *virtuous, worthy, upright*. And in this not uncommon ſenſe of the word, the laſt clauſe ſerves to exemplify the character, and not to contraſt it.

20. *To expoſe her*, αυτην παραδειγματισαι. E. T. *to make her a public example*. In order to expreſs things forcibly, tranſlators often, overlooking the modeſty of the original, ſay more than the author intended. It has not, however, been ſufficiently adverted to, in this inſtance, that by extending the import of the word παραδειγματισαι, they diminiſh the character of benignity aſcribed, by the hiſtorian, to Joſeph. It was not the writer's intention to ſay barely, that Joſeph was unwilling to drag her as a criminal before the judges, and get the ignominious ſentence of death, warranted by law, pronounced againſt her, which few perhaps would have done more than he; but that he was deſirous to conſult privacy in the manner of diſmiſſing her, that he might, as little as poſſible, wound her reputation. The word appears to me to denote no more than making the affair too flagrant, and ſo expoſing her to ſhame. So the Syrian interpreter, and the Arabian, underſtood the term. I have therefore choſen here to follow the example of the Vul. Leo, and Cal. who render the words *eam traducere*, rather than that of Caſt. and Piſc. who render them, *in eam exemplum edere*, and *eam exemplum facere*, which have been followed by our tranſlators. The expreſſions uſed by theſe naturally ſuggeſt to our minds a condemnation to ſuffer the rigour of the law. Yet the original word ſeems to relate ſolely to the diſgrace reſulting from the opinion of the public, and not to any other puniſhment, corporal

corporeal or pecuniary. Infamy is, indeed, a common attendant upon every ſort of public puniſhment. Hence, by a ſynecdoche of a part for the whole, it has been ſometimes employed to expreſs a public and ſhameful execution. And this has doubtleſs occaſioned the difficulty. But that it is frequently and moſt properly uſed, when no puniſhment is meant, but the publication of the crime, Raphelius, in his notes on the place, has, by his quotations from the moſt approved authors, put beyond a doubt. I ſhall bring one out of many. It is from Polybius, Legat 88. where he ſays, Η δε συγκλητος χρωμενη τω καιρω και βουλομενη ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ τες Ροδιους αποκρισιν εξεδωκεν ης ην τα συνεχοντα ταυτα. "The ſenate taking the opportunity, and "willing to *expoſe* the Rhodians, publiſhed their anſwer, whereof theſe are the heads." I ſhall only add, that Chr. one of the moſt eloquent of the Greek fathers, underſtood this paſſage in the goſpel as meaning no more; accurately diſtinguiſhing between παραδειγματιζειν and κολαζειν, *expoſing* and *puniſhing*. Thus he argues concerning Joſeph's conduct on this trying occaſion: Καιτοιγε η ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ μονον ην υπευθυνος η τοιαυτη· αλλα και ΚΟΛΑΣΕΣΘΑΙ αυτην ο νομος εκελευεν. Αλλ' ο Ιωσηφ η μονον το μειζον εκεινο, αλλα και το ελαττον συνεχωρησε, την αισχυνην· η γαρ μονον η ΚΟΛΑΣΑΙ, αλλ' ηδε ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ εζηλετο. "Now ſuch a woman, as "Mary was then thought to be, was not only expoſed "to *ſhame*, but alſo by law ſubjected to *puniſhment*. "Whereas Joſeph not only remitted the greater evil, "the *puniſhment*, but the leſs alſo, the *ignominy*: for he "determined not only not to *puniſh*, but not even to "*expoſe* her." For the meaning of a term which occurs in ſo few places in Scripture, and thoſe not unfavourable to the explanation given, a term with which no ancient controverſy was connected, the authority of ſuch a man as Chr. is juſtly held deciſive. The verdict of Euth. is in effect the ſame. This alſo is the ſenſe which the tranſlator into M. G. gives the term, ſaying, μη θελησιτανα την φανερωση, adding, as an illuſtration on the margin, να την πομπευση, *to defame her*.

3. *To divorce her*, απολυσαι αυτην. In the N. T. the word απολυειν is the ordinary term for *divorcing* a wife, and thereby diſſolving the marriage. Nor did it make any difference in the Jewiſh commonwealth, that the parties were only betrothed to each other, and that the marriage was not completed by cohabitation. From the moment of their reciprocal engagement, all the laws in relation to marriage were in force between them. He was her huſband, and ſhe his wife. Her infidelity to him was adultery, and appointed to be puniſhed as ſuch, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. In conformity to this is the ſtyle of our Evangeliſt. Joſeph is called, v. 16. Mary's *huſband*; ſhe, v. 20. his *wife;* the diſſolution of their contract is expreſſed by the ſame word that is uniformly uſed for the diſſolution of marriage by the *divorce* of the wife. I have preferred here and in other places, the term *divorcing*, to that of *putting away*. The latter phraſe is very ambiguous. Men are ſaid *to put away* their wives, when they put them out of their houſes, and will not live with them. Yet the marriage union ſtill ſubſiſts; and neither party is at liberty to marry another. This is not what is meant by απολυειν την γυναικα in the Goſpel. I ſhould in ſome places prefer the term *repudiate*, were it in more familiar uſe.

20. *A meſſenger*, αγγελος. Diſſer. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

22. *Verified*, πληρωθη. E. T. *fulfilled*. Though it ſhould be admitted, that the word πληρωθη is here uſed in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, to expreſs the fulfilment of a prophecy, which pointed to this ſingle event; it cannot be denied that the general import of the verb πληροω, in the Goſpel, is more properly expreſſed by the Eng. verb *verify*, than by *fulfil*. Thoſe things are ſaid πληρωθηναι, which are no predictions of the future, but mere affirmations concerning the preſent, or the paſt. Thus, ch. ii. 15. a declaration from the prophet Hoſea, xi. 1. which God made in relation to the people of Iſrael, whom he had long before recalled from Egypt, is applied by the hiſtorian allufively to Jeſus Chriſt, where all that is meant is, that, with equal truth, or rather with much greater energy of ſignification, God might now ſay, *I have recalled my Son out of Egypt*. Indeed the import of the Greek phraſe, as commonly uſed by the ſacred writers, is no more, as L. Cl. has juſtly obſerved, than that ſuch words of any of the prophets may be applied with truth to ſuch an event. For it is even uſed, where that which is ſaid to be fulfilled is not a prophecy, but a command; and where the event ſpoken of is not the obedience of the command (though the term is ſometimes uſed in this ſenſe alſo), but an event ſimilar to the thing required; and which, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, tallies with the words. Thus, in the directions given about the manner of preparing the paſchal lamb, it is ſaid, Exod. xii. 46. *None of his bones ſhall be broken*. This ſaying the evangeliſt J. xix. 36. finds *verified* in what happened to our Lord, when the legs of the criminals, who were crucified with him, were broken, and his were ſpared. 'But were not the 'recall of Iſrael from Egypt, and the ceremonies of the 'paſſover, typical of what happened to our Lord?' I admit they were. But it is not the correſpondence of the antitype to the type, that we call properly *fulfilling*: this Engliſh word, if I miſtake not, is, in ſtrictneſs, applied only, either to an event to which a prophecy directly points, or to the performance of a promiſe. Whereas the Greek word is ſometimes employed in Scripture to denote little more than a coincidence in ſound. In this ſenſe I think it is uſed, ch. ii. 23. We have an inſtance of its being employed by the Seventy, to denote *verifying*, or *confirming*, the teſtimony of one, by the teſtimony of another, 1 Kings, 1. 14. The word *fulfilling*, in our language, has a much more limited ſignification; and to employ it for all thoſe purpoſes, is to give a handle to cavillers, where the original gives none. It makes the ſacred penman appear to call thoſe things predictions, which plainly were not, and which they never meant to denominate predictions.

The

The moſt appoſite word that I could find in Engliſh is *verify;* for, though it will not anſwer in every caſe, it anſwers in more caſes than any other of our verbs. Thus, a prophecy is *verified* (for the word is ſtrictly applicable here alſo), when it is accompliſhed; a promiſe, when it is performed; a teſtimony, when it is confirmed by additional teſtimony, or other ſatisfactory evidence; a maxim or proverb, when it is exemplified; a declaration of any kind may be ſaid to be *verified* by any incident to which the words can be applied. I acknowledge that this word does not in every caſe correſpond to πληροω. A law is *fulfilled*, not *verified;* and if the import of the paſſage be to denote that additional ſtrength is given to it, it is better to ſay *confirmed*, or *ratified.* In ſome places it means to *fill up*, in others to *perfect*, in others to *make known.* Thus much I thought it neceſſary to obſerve, in regard to my frequent uſe of a verb which is but rarely to be found in other Eng. tranſlations.

2. Ἱνα πληρωθη, literally, *that it might be verified.* The conjunction, in all ſuch caſes, denotes no more, than that there was as exact a conformity between the event and the paſſage quoted, as there could have been, if the former had been effected, merely for the accompliſhment of the latter. God does not bring about an event, becauſe ſome Prophet had foretold it; but the Prophet was inſpired to foretel it, becauſe God had previouſly decreed the event. If ſuch particles as ἱνα or ὁπως, were to be always rigorouſly interpreted, we ſhould be led into the moſt abſurd concluſions. For inſtance, we ſhould deduce from J. xix. 24. that the Roman ſoldiers, Pagans, who knew nothing of holy writ, acted, in dividing our Lord's garments, and caſting lots for his veſture, not from any deſire of ſharing the ſpoil, but purely with a view that the Scriptures relating to the Meſſiah might be fulfilled; for it is ſaid that they reſolved on this meaſure, ἱνα η γραφη πληρωθη η λεγουσα.— See note on ch. viii. 17.

23. *The virgin*, η παρθενος. I do not ſay that the article is always emphatical, though it is generally ſo; or that there is a particular emphaſis on it, in this paſſage, as it ſtands in the Goſpel. But the words are in this place a quotation; and it is proper that the quotation ſhould be exhibited, when warranted by the original, as it is in the book quoted. Both the Sep. and the Heb. in the paſſage of Iſaiah refered to, introduce the name *virgin* with the artitle; and as in this they have been copied by the Evangeliſt, the article ought doubtleſs to be preſerved in the tranſlation.

25. *Her firſt-born ſon*, τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον. As there were certain prerogatives which, by the Jewiſh conſtitution, belonged to primogeniture, thoſe entitled to the prerogatives were invariably denominated *the firſt-born*, whether the parents had iſſue afterwards or not. Nothing, therefore, in relation to this point, can be inferred from the epithet here uſed. The turn which Mr. Weſ. and others, have given the expreſſion in their verſions, *her ſon, the firſt-born*, though to appearance more literal, is neither ſo natural nor ſo juſt as the common tranſlation. It is founded on the repetition of the article before the word *firſt-born.* But it is poſſible that they ſhould not have obſerved, that nothing is more common in Gr. when an adjective follows its ſubſtantive, eſpecially if a pronoun or other word intervene, than to repeat the article before the adjective? This is indeed ſo common, that it is accounted an idiom of the tongue, inſomuch that, where it is omitted, there appears rather an ellipſis in the expreſſion. Sc. in his notes on this verſe, has produced ſeveral parallel expreſſions from Scripture, which it would be ridiculous to tranſlate in the ſame manner; and which therefore clearly evince that there is no emphaſis in the idiom.

2. In regard to the preceding clauſe, *Joſeph knew her not until*, εως ὁ; all we can ſay, is, that it does not neceſſarily imply his knowledge of her afterwards. That the expreſſion ſuggeſts the affirmative rather than the negative, can hardly be denied by any candid critic. The quotations, produced in ſupport of the contrary opinion, are not entirely ſimilar to the caſe in hand, as has been proved by Dr. Wh. in his commentary. And as there appears here no Hebraiſm, or peculiarity of idiom, to vindicate our giving a different turn to the clauſe, I cannot approve Beau.'s manner of rendering it, though not materially different in ſenſe: *Mais il ne l'avoit point connu lors qu'elle mit au monde ſon fils premier né.* The P. R. tranſlation and Si.'s are to the ſame purpoſe. The only reaſon which a tranſlator could have here for this ſlight diviation, was a reaſon which cannot be juſtified; to render the Evangeliſt's expreſſion more favourable, or at leaſt leſs unfavourable, to his own ſentiments. But there is this good leſſon to be learnt, even from the manner wherein ſome points have been paſſed over by the ſacred writers; namely, that our curioſity in regard to them is impertinent; and that our controverſies concerning them favour little of the knowledge, and leſs of the ſpirit, of the Goſpel.

CHAP. II.

1. *Eaſtern Magians*, μαγοι απο ανατολων. E. T. *wiſe men from the Eaſt;* rendering the word μαγοι, as though it were ſynonymous with σοφοι. This is not only an indefinite, but an improper verſion of the term. It is indefinite, becauſe thoſe called μαγοι, were a particular claſs, party, or profeſſion among the Orientals, as much as Stoics, Peripatetics, and Epicureans, were among the Greeks. They originated in Perſia, but afterwards ſpread into other countries, particularly into Aſſyria and Arabia, bordering upon Judea on the Eaſt. It is probable that the Magians here mentioned came from Arabia. Now to employ a term for ſpecifying one ſect, which may, with equal propriety, be applied to fifty, of totally different, or even contrary, opinions, is ſurely a vague manner of tranſlating. It is alſo, in the preſent acceptation of the word, improper. Formerly the term *wiſe men* denoted philoſophers, or men of ſcience and erudition; it is hardly ever uſed ſo now, unleſs

unleſs in burleſque. Dod. perhaps comes nearer, in uſing the term *ſages;* as this term is ſometimes appropriated, though ſeldom ſeriouſly in proſe, to men of ſtudy and learning: but it is ſtill too indefinite and general, ſince it might have been equally applied to Indian Bramins, Gr. philoſophers, and many others; whereas the term here employed is applicable to one ſect only. This is, therefore, one of thoſe caſes wherein the tranſlator, that he may do juſtice to his author, and not miſlead his readers, is obliged to retain the original term. Diſſ. VIII. P. II. § I. Sc. and others ſay *Magi;* I have preferred Prideaux's term *Magians;* both as having more the form of an Eng. word, and as the ſingular *Magian*, for which there is occaſion in another place, is much better adapted to our ears, eſpecially when attended with an article, than *Magus*. The ſtudies of the Magians ſeem to have lien principally in aſtronomy, natural philoſophy, and theology. It is from them we derive the terms *magic* and *magician*, words which were doubtleſs uſed originally in a good, but are now always uſed in a bad, ſenſe.

2. *We have ſeen his ſtar in the eaſt country,* ειδομεν αυτυ τον αστερα εν τη ανατολη. E. T. *we have ſeen his ſtar in the Eaſt.* To ſee either ſtar or meteor in the Eaſt, means in Eng. to ſee it in the eaſt quarter of the heavens, or looking eaſtwards. But this is not the Apoſtle's meaning here. The meaning here manifeſtly is, that when the Magians themſelves were in the Eaſt, they ſaw the ſtar. So far were they from ſeeing the ſtar in the Eaſt, according to the Eng. acceptation of the phraſe, that they muſt have ſeen it in the Weſt, as they were, by its guidance, brought out of the eaſt country weſtwards to Jeruſalem. Thus the plural of the ſame word, in the preceding verſe, ſignifies the countries lying eaſt from Judea, μαγοι απο ανατολων. Some render the phraſe εν τη ανατολη, *at its riſe.* But, 1ſt, The words in that caſe ought to have been, εν τη ανατολη αυτυ; 2dly, The term is never ſo applied in Scripture to any of the heavenly luminaries, except the ſun; 3dly, It is very improbable that a luminous body, formed ſolely for guiding the Magians to Bethlehem, would appear to perform the diurnal revolution of the heavens from Eaſt to Weſt. The expreſſion uſed in Lu.'s verſion, im morgenlande, coincides entirely with that here employed.

2. *To do him homage,* προσκυνησαι αυτω. The homage of proſtration, which is ſignified by this Gr. word, in ſacred authors, as well as in profane, was, throughout all aſia, commonly paid to kings and other ſuperiors, both by Jews and by Pagans. It was paid by Moſes to his father-in-law, Exod. xviii. 7. called in the E. T. *obeiſance*. The inſtances of this application are ſo numerous, both in the O. T. and in the N. as to render more quotations unneceſſary. When God is the object, the word denotes adoration in the higheſt ſenſe. In old Eng. the term *worſhip* was indifferently uſed of both. It is not commonly ſo now.

4. *The chief prieſts,* τυς αρχιερεις. By the term αρχιερεις, *chief prieſts*, in the N. T. is commonly meant, not only thoſe who were, or had been *high prieſts* (for this office was not then, as formerly, for life), but alſo the heads of the twenty-four courſes, or ſacerdotal families, into which the whole prieſthood was divided.

2. *Scribes of the people,* γραμματεις τυ λαυ; the men of letters, interpreters of the law, and inſtructors of the people.

6. *In the canton of Juda,* γη Ιυδα. E. T. *in the land of Juda.* The word γη, without the article joined to the name of a tribe, alſo without the article, denotes the *canton* or territory aſſigned to that tribe. In this ſenſe, γη Ζαβυλων, and γη Νεφθαλειμ, occur in ch. iv. 15. As the land of Juda might be underſtood for the country of Judea, I thought it proper to diſtinguiſh in the verſion things ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed in the original.

2. *Art not the leaſt illuſtrious among the cities of Judah,* ουδαμως ελαχιστη ει εν τοις ηγεμοσιν Ιυδα. E. T. *Art not the leaſt among the princes of Judah.* The term ηγεμων, in this place, denotes *illuſtrious, eminent.* The metaphor *prince*, applied to city, is rather harſh in modern languages. It is remarked, that this quotation agrees not exactly either with the Heb. text, or with the Gr. verſion. There appears even a contradiction in the firſt clauſe to both theſe, as in them there is no negative particle. The moſt approved way of reconciling them, is by ſuppoſing that the words in the Prophet are an interrogation, which, agreeably to the idiom of moſt languages, is equivalent to a negation. On this hypotheſis we muſt read in the O. T. *Art thou the leaſt?* And in written language, an interrogation is not always to be diſtinguiſhed from a declaration; though in ſpeaking it may, by the emphaſis, be clearly diſtinguiſhable. But, whatever be in this, it ought to be obſerved, that the quotation is only reported by the Evangeliſt, as part of the anſwer returned to Herod, by the chief prieſts and the ſcribes.

7. *Procured from them exact information,* ηκριβωσε παρ' αυτων. E. T. *Inquired of them diligently.* In conformity to this is the greater part of modern tranſlations. The Vul. renders it *diligenter didicit ab eis*, making very rightly the import of the verb ακριβοω to lie chiefly not in the diligence of the enquiry, but in the ſucceſs of it. Agreeable to this are moſt of the ancient verſions, particularly the Sy. and the Ara. Dod. and Sc. have preferred theſe, and rendered the words, *Got exact information from them.* That this is more conformable to the import of the word, is evident from v. 16. where Herod makes uſe of the information he had gotten, for directing his emiſſaries in the execution of the bloody purpoſe on which they were ſent; *according to the time* (as our tranſlators expreſs it) *which he had diligently inquired of the wiſe men.* This is not perfectly intelligible. It could not be the queſtions put by Herod, but the anſwers returned by the Magians, which could be of uſe for directing them. But, though the verſions of Sc. and Dod. are preferable to the common one, they do not hit entirely the meaning of the Gr. word. It ſignifies, indeed, to get exact information, but not accidentally,

dentally, or any how; it is only in consequence of inquiry, or at least of means used on the part of the informed. Be. has not badly rendered the verb, *exquisivit*, searched out, denoting both the means employed, and the effect. The better to show that this was his idea, he has given this explanation in the margin, *Certo et explorate cognovit.*

12. *Being warned in a dream*, χρηματισθεντες κατ' ονειρ. E. T. *Being warned of God in a dream.* With this agree some ancient, and most modern, translations, introducing the term *response*, *oracle*, *divinity*, or something equivalent. The Syr. has preserved the simplicity of the original, importing only, *it was signified to them in a dream*, and is followed by L. Cl. That the warning came from God, there can be no doubt: but as this is not expressed, but implied, in the original, it ought to be exhibited in the same manner in the version. What is said explicitly in the one, should be said explicitly in the other; what is conveyed only by implication in the one, should be conveyed only by implication in the other. Now that χρηματιζειν does not necessarily imply *from God*, more than the word *warning* does, is evident from the reference which, both in sacred authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. See acts x. 22. where the name of God is indeed both unnecessarily and improperly introduced in the translation, xi. 26. Rom. vii. 3. Heb. xii. 25. For Pagan authorities, see Raphelius.

16. *Deceived*, ενεπαιχθη. E. T. *mocked.* In the Jewish style, we find often that any treatment which appears disrespectful, comes under the general appellation of *mockery*. Thus, Potiphar's wife, in the false accusation she preferred against Joseph, of making an attempt upon her chastity, says that *he came in to mock her*, Gen. xxxix. 17. εμπαιξαι is the word employed by the Seventy. Balaam accused his ass of *mocking him*, when she would not yield to his direction, Num. xxii. 29. And Dalilah said to Samson, Jud. xvi. 10. *Thou hast mocked* (that is, *deceived*) *me, and told me lies.* As one who deceived them, appeared to treat them contemptuously, they were naturally led to express the former by the latter. But as we cannot do justice to the original, by doing violence to the language which we write, I thought it better to give the sense of the author, than servilely to trace his idiom.

*. *The male children*, τους παιδας. Thus also Dod. and others. E. T. *The children.* Sc. follows this version, but says in the notes, "Perhaps *male children*;" adding, "Not that the masculine article τους excludes *female* "*children*: for had our historian intended to include "both sexes under one word, παιδας, he would have "prefixed the masculine article as now." But how does he know that? In support of his assertion, he has not produced a single example. He has shewn, indeed, what nobody doubts, that as παις is of the common gender, the addition of αρρην or θηλυ serves to distinguish the sex without the article. But it is also true, that the attendance of the article ὁ or ἡ answers the purpose, without the addition of αρρην or θηλυ. *Pueri* and *puellæ* are not more distinguished by the termination in Latin, than οἱ παιδες and αἱ παιδες are distinguished by the article in Greek. I do not deny, that there may be instances wherein the term οἱ παιδες, like οἱ υἱοι, may mean children in general. The phrase, both in Hebrew and in Greek, is *the sons of Israel*, which our translators render, *the children of Israel*, as nobody doubts that the whole posterity is meant. We address an audience of men and women by the title *brethren*; and under the denomination, *all men*, the whole species is included. But in such examples, the universality of the application is either previously known from common usage, or is manifest from the subject or occasion. Where this cannot be said, the words ought to be strictly interpreted. Add to this, 1st, That the historian seems here purposely to have changed the term παιδιον, which is used for *child*, no less than nine times in this chapter; as that word being neuter, and admitting only the neuter article, was not fit for marking the distinction of sexes; and to have adopted a term which he nowhere else employs for infants, though frequently for men-servants, and once for youths or boys: 2dly, That the reason of the thing points to the interpretation I have given. It made no more for Herod's purpose to destroy female children, than to massacre grown men and women; and, tyrant though he was, that he meant to go no farther than, in his way of judging, his own security rendered expedient, is evident from the instructions he gave to his emissaries, in regard to the age of the infants to be sacrificed to his jealousy, that they might not exceed such an age, or be under such another.

3. *From those entering the second year, down to the time*, απο διετους και κατωτερω, κατα τον χρονον. E. T. *From two years old and under, according to the time.* There can be no doubt, that in this direction Herod intended to specify both the age above which, and the age under which, infants were not to be involved in this massacre. But there is some scope for inquiry into the import of the description given. Were those of the second year included, or excluded by it? By the common translation they are included; by that given above excluded. Plausible things may be advanced on each side. The reasons which have determined me, are as follows. The word διετης is one of those which, in scriptural criticism, we call απαξ λεγομενα. It occurs in no other place of the N. T. nor in the Sep. It is explained by Hesychius and Phavorinus, that which lives a whole year, ὁ ὁλον το ετος. Διετησιος is also explained in our common lexicons, *per totum annum durans, anniversarius*: and the verb διετιζω is used by Aristotle for *living a whole year*. At the same time it must be owned, that the explanation *bimulus*, *biennis*, is also given to the word διετης. The term is therefore doubtless equivocal; but what weighs with me here principally is, the ordinary method used by the Jews in reckoning time; which is to count the imperfect days, months, or years, as though they were complete, speaking of a period begun, as if it were ended. Thus it is said, Gen. xvii. 12. *The*

child that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised; and Lev. xii. 3. *On the eighth day he shall be circumcised.* Now it is evident, that in the way this precept was understood, it behoved them often to circumcise their children when they were not seven days old, and never to wait till they were eight. For the day of the birth, however little of it remained, was reckoned the first; and the day of the circumcision, however little of it was spent, was reckoned the eighth. But nothing can set this matter in a stronger light than what is recorded of our Lord's death and resurrection. We are told by himself, that he was to be three days and three nights in the bosom of the earth; that his enemies would kill him, and that after three days he would rise again. Yet certain it is, that our Lord was not two days, or forty-eight hours (though still part of three days), under the power of death. He expired late on the sixth day of the week, and rose early on the first of the ensuing week. Both these considerations lead me to conclude, with Wh. and Dod. that Herod, by the instructions given to his messengers, meant to make the highest limit of their commission, those entering, not finishing the second year. The lowest we are not told, but only that it was regulated by the information he had received from the Magians; for this I take to be the import of the clause, κατα τον χρονον. He had probably concluded, that the star did not appear till the birth, though they might not see it on its first appearance, and that, therefore, he could be in no danger from children born long before, or at all after, it had been seen by them. Supposing then, it had appeared just half a year before he gave this cruel order, the import would be, that they should kill none above twelve months old, or under six.

18. *In Ramah,* Εν Ραμα. Ramah was a city on the confines of Benjamin, not far from Bethlehem in Judah. As Rachel was the mother of Benjamin, she is here, by the Prophet Jeremiah, from whom the words are quoted, introduced as most nearly concerned. It is true, however, that in the Heb. the term rendered *in Ramah,* may be translated *on high.* And both Origen and Jerom were of opinion that it ought to be so translated. But the authors of the Sep. have thought otherwise; and it is more than probable that the Evangelist, or his translator, have judged it best to follow that version. The mention of Rachel as lamenting on this occasion, gives a probability to the common version of the Prophet's expression. Otherwise it would have been more natural to exhibit Leah the mother of Judah, than Rachel the mother of Benjamin, as inconsolable on account of a massacre perpetrated in a city of Judah, and aimed against one of that tribe.

[2] *Lamentation and weeping, and bitter complaint,* θρηνος και κλαυθμος και οδυρμος πολυς. Vul. *Ploratus et ululatus multus.* In three Gr. copies θρηνος και are wanting. All the three words are in the Sep. in the passage referred to, though there are but two corresponding words in the Heb. In most of the ancient versions there is the same omission as in the Vul.

22. *Hearing that Archelaus had succeeded his father Herod in the throne of Judea, he was afraid to return thither.* Archelaus was constituted by Augustus *ethnarch* (that is, ruler of the nation, but in title inferior to *king*) over Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. The Orientals, however, commonly gave to such, and indeed to all sovereigns, the appellation of *kings.* The emperor is repeatedly so named in Scripture. And here the word εβασιλευσεν is applied to Archelaus, who succeeded his father, not in title, but in authority, over the principal part, not the whole, of his dominions. But though Joseph was afraid to go into Judea, strictly so called, he still continued in the land of Israel; for under that name *Galilee,* and a considerable extent of country lying east of the Jordan, were included. Prel. Diss. I. P. I. § 7.

23. *That he should be called a Nazarene,* οτι Ναζωραιος κληθησεται. E. T. *He shall be called a Nazarene.* The words may be rendered either way. A direct quotation is often introduced with the conjunction οτι. On the other hand, that the verb is in the indicative is no objection of any weight, against translating the passage obliquely. The Heb. has no subjunctive mood, and therefore the indicative in the N. T. is often used subjunctively, in conformity to the Oriental idiom. And, as there is no place, in the Prophets still extant, where we have this affirmation in so many words, I thought it beter to give an oblique turn to the expression.

[2] Some say, *Nazarean,* to mark a difference between the term used here, and the common one for an inhabitant of Nazareth, Ναζαρηνος; but as the former term is also used in the same sense by both Mr. and J. I could see no reason for this small variation. Some find a coincidence in the name with a Heb. word for a *Nazarite;* others for a word signifying *branch,* a term by which the Messiah, in the judgment of Jews as well as of Christians, is denominated, Isaiah xi. 1.

It is proper to observe that, in the Heb. exemplar of this Gospel which was used by the Ebionites, and called *The Gospel according to the Hebrews,* the two first chapters were wanting:—the book began in this manner, *It happened, in the days of Herod king of Judea, that John came baptising, with the baptism of reformation, in the river Jordan. He was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, and son of Zacharias and Elizabeth.* But for this reading, and the rejection of the two chapters, there is not one concurrent testimony from MSS. versions, or ancient authors. It is true the Al. has not the two chapters; but this is no authority for rejecting them, as that copy is mutilated, and contains but a very small fragment of Mt.'s Gospel. No fewer than the twenty-four first chapters are wanting, and the copy begins with the verb ερχεται, *cometh,* in the middle of a sentence, ch. xxv. 6. By a like mutilation, though much less considerable, the first nineteen verses of the first chapter are wanting in the Cam. which also begins in the middle of a sentence with the verb παραλαβειν, *to take home.* And in the Go. version all is wanting before the middle of the fifteenth verse of ch. v. It begins likewise

likewiſe in the middle of a ſentence with the words anſwering to ὅτι τὴν λυχνίαν. Now if we abſtract from theſe, which prove nothing, but that the words they begin with were preceded by ſomething now loſt; there is a perfect harmony in the teſtimonies, both of MSS. and of verſions, in favour of the two chapters. The old Itc. tranſlation and the Syr. were probably made before the name *Ebionite* was known in the church. Even ſo early a writer as Ireneus, in the fragment formerly quoted (Pref. § 7.), takes notice that Mt. began his hiſtory with the genealogy of Jeſus. That the Nazarenes, who alſo uſed a Heb. exemplar of this Goſpel, had the two chapters, is probable, as Epiphanius calls their copy very full, πληρέστατον, though, it muſt be owned, he immediately after expreſſes ſome doubt of their retaining the pedigree. Si. thinks it probable that they did retain it, as he learns from Epiphanius that Carpocras and Cerinthus, whoſe notions pretty much coincided with theirs, retained it, and even uſed it in arguing againſt their adverſaries. I might add to the teſtimony of verſions, MSS. and ancient authors, the internal evidence we have of the vitiation of the Ebionite exemplar, the only copy that is charged with this defect, from the very nature of the additions and alterations it contains.

CHAP. III.

1. *In thoſe days.* As the thing laſt mentioned was the reſidence of Jeſus with his parents at Nazareth, the words *thoſe days* may be uſed with ſtrict propriety of any time before he left that city. Now John was about ſix months older than Jeſus; it may therefore be thought not improbable that he began his public miniſtry ſo much earlier, each in the 30th year of his age, agreeably to the practice of the Levites, Num. iv. 3. But it muſt be owned that this is no more than conjecture; for as to the age of the Baptiſt, when he commenced preacher, ſcripture has been ſilent.

2. *The Baptiſt,* ὁ Βαπτιστης. A title from his office, not a proper name. It is equivalent to the title given him, Mr. vi. 14. ὁ Βαπτιζων, *the Baptiſer.* It is therefore improperly rendered into modern languages without the article, As Dio. has done in Itn. calling him *Giovanni Battiſta,* and all the Fr. tranſlators I know (except L. Cl.), who call him *Jean Baptiſte.*

3. *Cried,* κηρυσσων. Diſſ. VI. P. V.

4. *Wilderneſs,* ἐρημω. Mr. i. 3. N.

2. *Reform,* μετανοειτε. Diſſ. VI. P. III.

2. *Reign,* βασιλεια. Diſſ. V. P. I.

4. *Of camel's hair,* not of the fine hair of that animal, whereof an elegant kind of cloth is made, which is thence called *camlet* (in imitation of which, though made of wool, is the Engliſh *camlet*), but of the long and ſhaggy hair of camels, which is in the Eaſt manufactured into a coarſe ſtuff, anciently worn by monks and anchorets. It is only when underſtood in this way that the words ſuit the deſcription here given of John's manner of life.

2. *Locuſts,* ακριδες. I ſee no ground to doubt that it was the animal ſo named that is meant here. *Locuſts* and *graſshoppers* are among the things allowed by the law to be eaten, Lev. xi. 22. and are at this day eaten in Aſia by the poorer ſort; I have never had ſatisfactory evidence that the word is ſuſceptible of any other interpretation.

5. *The country along the Jordan,* ἡ περιχωρος τ. Ἰορδανου. Mr. i. 28. N.

7. *From the impending vengeance,* απο της μελλουσης οργης. E. T. *From the wrath to come.* Μελλων often means not only *future,* but *near.* There is juſt ſuch a difference between εσαι and μελλει εσεσθαι, in Gr. as there is between *it will be* and *it is about to be,* in Eng. This holds particularly in threats and warnings. Εσαι λιμος is *erit fames;* μελλει εσεσθαι λιμος is *imminet fames.* In Job iii. 8. a Heb. word ſignifying *ready, prepared,* is rendered by the Seventy μελλων. Beſides, its connection with the verb φυγειν in this verſe aſcertains the import of the word. We think of fleeing only when purſued. The flight itſelf naturally ſuggeſts to ſpectators that the enemy is at hand. In caſes however wherein no more appears to be intended than the bare prediction of an event, or declaration of ſome purpoſe, we are to conſider it as equivalent to an ordinary future, ch. xvii. 22. N. The words, *the wrath to come,* appear to limit the ſenſe to what is ſtrictly called *the future judgment.*

8. *The proper fruit of reformation,* καρπους αξιους της μετανοιας. E. T. *fruits meet for repentance.* Vul. *fructum dignum pœnitentiæ.* A very great number of Gr. MSS. read καρπον αξιον, amongſt which are ſome of the oldeſt and moſt valued; likewiſe ſeveral ancient verſions, as the Ara. the ſecond Sy. Cop. Eth. and Sax. It appears too, that ſome of the earlieſt fathers read in the ſame manner. Of the moderns, Lu. Gro. Si. Ben. Mill, and Wet. have approved it. It is ſo read in the Com. and ſome other old editions. Καρπους αξιους is univerſally allowed to be the genuine reading in L. Some ignorant tranſcriber has probably thought proper to correct one Goſpel by the other. Such freedoms have been too often uſed.

10. *Turned into fuel.* Ch. vi. 30. 2 N.

11. *In water—in the Holy Spirit,* εν ὑδατι—εν ἁγιῳ πνευματι. E. T. *with water—with the Holy Ghoſt.* Vul. *in aqua—in Spiritu Sancto.* Thus alſo the Sy. and other ancient verſions. All the modern tranſlations from the Gr. which I have ſeen, render the words as our common verſion does, except L. Cl. who ſays *dans l'eau —dans le Saint Eſprit.* I am ſorry to obſerve that the Popiſh tranſlators from the Vul. have ſhown greater veneration for the ſtyle of that verſion than the generality of Proteſtant tranſlators have ſhown for that of the original. For in this the La. is not more explicit than the Gr. Yet ſo inconſiſtent are the interpreters laſt mentioned, that none of them have ſcrupled to

render εν τω Ιορδανη, in the ſixth verſe, *in Jordan*, though nothing can be plainer, than that if there be any incongruity in the expreſſion *in water*, this *in Jordan* muſt be equally incongruous. But they have ſeen that the prepoſition *in* could not be avoided there, without adopting a circumlocution, and ſaying *with the water of Jordan*, which would have made their deviation from the text too glaring. The word βαπτιζειν, both in ſacred authors, and in claſſical, ſignifies, *to dip*, *to plunge*, *to immerſe*, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldeſt of the La. fathers, *tingere*, the term uſed for dying cloth, which was by immerſion. It is always conſtrued ſuitably to this meaning. Thus it is εν ὑδατι, εν τω Ιορδανη. But I ſhould not lay much ſtreſs on the prepoſition εν, which, anſwering to the Heb. ב, may denote *with* as well as *in*, did not the whole phraſeology, in regard to this ceremony, concur in evincing the ſame thing. Accordingly the baptiſed are ſaid αναβαινειν, *to ariſe*, *emerge*, or *aſcend*, v. 16. απο του ὑδατος, and Acts viii. 39. εκ του ὑδατος, *from* or *out of the water*. When therefore the Gr. word is adopted, I may ſay, rather than tranſlated into modern languages, the mode of conſtruction ought to be preſerved ſo far as may conduce to ſuggeſt its original import. It is to be regretted that we have ſo much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the ſentiments and cuſtoms of the ſect which they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the ſpirit, by that of the party.

2. *In the Holy Spirit and fire*, εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι. Hey. *with holy wind and fire*. This moſt uncommon, though not entirely new, verſion of that learned and ingenious, but ſometimes fanciful, interpreter, is ſupported by the following arguments: 1ſt, The word πνευμα, which ſignifies both *ſpirit* and *wind*, has not here the article by which *the Holy Spirit* is commonly diſtinguiſhed. 2dly, the following verſe, which ſhould be regarded as an illuſtration of this, mentions the cleanſing of the wheat, which is by *the wind* ſeparating the chaff, and the conſuming of the chaff by *the fire*. 3dly, The three elements, water, air, and fire, were all conſidered by the Jews as purifiers, and, in reſpect of their purifying quality, were ranked in the order now named, water the loweſt, and fire the higheſt. The mention of the other two gives a preſumption that the third was not omitted. The following anſwers are ſubmitted to the reader: 1ſt, The article, though often, for diſtinction's ſake, prefixed to αγιον πνευμα, is, when either the ſcope of the place, or the other terms employed, ſerve the purpoſe of diſtinguiſhing, frequently omitted. Now this purpoſe is more effectually ſerved by the epithet αγιον, *holy*, than it could have been by the article. In ch. i. 18. and 20. the miraculous conception is twice ſaid to be εκ πνευματος αγιου, without the article. Yet Hey. himſelf has rendered it in both places *the Holy Spirit*. Further, I ſuſpect that no clear example can be produced of this adjective joined to πνευμα, where the meaning of πνευμα is *wind*. At leaſt I have never heard of any ſuch. 2dly, the ſubſequent verſe is certainly not to be underſtood as an illuſtration of this, but as farther information concerning Jeſus. This verſe repreſents the manner in which he will admit his diſciples; the next, that in which he will judge them at the end of the world. 3dly, I can ſee no reaſon, on the Dr.'s hypotheſis, why *air* or *wind* ſhould alone of all the elements be dignified with the epithet *holy*. *Fire*, in that view, would have a preferable title, being conſidered as the moſt perfect refiner of them all. Yet in no part of the N. T. is mention made of either *holy water* or *holy fire*. Now as it is acknowledged that πνευμα commonly ſignifies *ſpirit*, and when joined with αγιον *the Divine Spirit*, the word, by all the laws of interpretation, conſidering the peculiarity of the attribute with which it is accompanied, muſt be ſo underſtood here. It is however but doing juſtice to that reſpectable author to obſerve that he does not differ from others, in regard to the principal view of the paſſage, the effuſion of the Holy Spirit; only he thinks that the literal import of the word πνευμα in this place is *wind*, and that *the ſpirit* is but ſuggeſted to us by a figure.

3. *And fire*, και πυρι. Theſe words are wanting in ſeveral MSS. but they are found in a greater number, as well as in the Sy. the Vul. and all the ancient verſions.

12. *His winnowing ſhovel is in his hand*, ου το πτυον εν τη χειρι αυτου. E. T. *Whoſe fan is in his hand*. Vul. *Cujus ventilabrum in manu ſua*. In the old Vul. or Itc. the word was *pala*, properly *a winnowing ſhovel*, of which mention is made Iſa. xxx. 24. This implement of huſbandry is very ancient, ſimple, and properly manual. The *fan* (or *van*, as it is ſometimes called,) is more complex, and being contrived for raiſing an artificial wind, by the help of ſails, can hardly be conſidered as proper for being carried about in the hand.

15. *Thus ought we to ratify every inſtitution*, ουτω πρεπον εστιν ημιν πληρωσαι πασαν δικαιοσυνην. E. T. *Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteouſneſs*. In the opinion of Chryſoſtom, and other expoſitors, δικαιοσυνη ſignifies in this place *divine precept*. It is the word by which משפט *miſhpat*, in Heb. often denoting an *inſtitution* or *ordinance* of religion, is ſometimes rendered by the Seventy. I have choſen here to tranſlate the verb πληρωσαι rather *ratify* than *fulfil*, becauſe the conformity of Jeſus in this inſtance was not the perſonal obedience of one who was comprehended in the precept, and needed with others the benefit of purification, but it was the ſanction of his example given to John's baptiſm as a divine ordinance.

16. *No ſooner aroſe out of the water than heaven was opened to him*, ευθυς απο του ὑδατος, και ιδου ανεωχθησαν αυτω οι ουρανοι. E. T. *Went up ſtraightway out of the water, and lo the heavens were opened unto him*. That the adverb ευθυς, though joined with the firſt verb, does properly belong to the ſecond, was juſtly remarked by Grotius. Of this idiom, Mr. i. 29. and xi. 2. are alſo examples.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

1. *By the devil,* υπο του διαβολου. Diff. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

3. *A ſon of God,* υιος του Θεου. E. T. *The ſon of God.* It does not appear to be without deſign that the article is omitted both in this verſe and in the ſixth. The words ought therefore to be rendered indefinitely *a ſon,* not emphatically *the ſon.* In the parallel paſſage in L. iv. 3. there is the ſame omiſſion. And though in the 9th verſe of that chapter we find the article in the preſent common Gr. it is wanting in ſo many ancient MSS. and approved editions, that it is juſtly rejected by critics. Whether we are to impute Satan's expreſſing himſelf thus to his ignorance, as not knowing the dignity of the perſonage whom he accoſted, or to his malignity, as being averſe to ſuppoſe more than an equality with other good men (for he does not acknowledge even ſo much); certain it is, that the paſſage he quotes from the Pſalms, admits a general application to all pious perſons. The omiſſion of the definite article in this place is the more remarkable, as in the preceding chapter in both Goſpels, the appropriation of the term υιος by means of the article, in the voice from heaven, is very ſtrongly marked, ὁ υιος μου ὁ αγαπητος. See N. on ch. xiv. 33. xxvii. 54.

2. *Loaves,* αρτοι. E. T. *Bread.* Αρτος, uſed indefinitely, is rightly tranſlated *bread;* but when joined with ις, or any other word limiting the ſignification in the ſingular number, ought to be rendered *loaf;* in the plural it ought almoſt always to be rendered *loaves.* Even if either were proper, *loaves* would be preferable in this place, as being more picturesque. Our tranſlators have here followed the Sy. interpreter, who ſeems to have read αρτος.

4. *By every thing which God is pleaſed to appoint,* επι παντι ρηματι εκπορευομενῳ δια στοματος Θεου. E. T. *By every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.* The whole ſentence is given as a quotation. *It is written.* The place quoted is Deut. viii. 3. where Moſes, ſpeaking to the Iſraelites, ſays, *He humbled thee, and ſuffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knew'ſt not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live.* It is evident that the Jewiſh lawgiver is ſpeaking here of the food of the body, or ſuſtenance of the animal life; as it was this purpoſe ſolely which the manna ſerved, and which could not, in our idiom, be denominated a *word.* The reader may obſerve that the term *word* in the paſſage of the O. T. quoted is, in our Bible, printed in Italics, to denote that there is no correſponding term in the original. It might therefore have been literally rendered from the Heb. *every thing.* In the Sep. from which the quotation in the Goſpel is copied, the ellipſis is ſupplied by ρημα. But let it be obſerved, that in Scripture both the Heb. דבר *dabar,* and the Gr. ρημα, and ſometimes λογος, mean indifferently *word* or *thing.* Take the following examples out of a much greater number. L. i. 37. Οτι αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα. *Nothing is impoſſible with God.* —ii. 15. *Let us now go to Bethlehem and ſee this thing,* το ρημα τουτο, *which is come to paſs.* The phraſe το εκπορευομενον (or εξελθον) εκ του στοματος, is oftner than once to be met with, in the verſion of the Seventy, for a *declared purpoſe, reſolution,* or *appointment.* See Num. xxxii. 24. 1 Sam. i. 23. But nothing can be more expreſs to our purpoſe than Jer. xliv. 17. Ποιησομεν παντα λογον ὁς εξελευσεται εκ του στοματος ἡμων. E. T. *We will do whatſoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth,* παντα λογον, in Heb. כל חרבר, *col hadabar, every word,* that is, *we will do whatſoever we have purpoſed.* The verſion I have given is, therefore, entirely agreeable both to the ſenſe of the paſſage quoted, and to the idiom of holy writ. I may add, that it is much better adapted to the context than the allegorical explanation which ſome give of the words, as relating purely to the ſpiritual life. The hiſtorian tells us that Jeſus had faſted forty days, that he was hungry, and in a deſert, where food was not to be had. The tempter taking his opportunity, interpoſes, "If thou be the Meſſiah, con-"vert theſe ſtones into loaves." The queſtion was ſimply, What, in this exigence, was to be done for ſuſtaining life? Our Saviour anſwers very pertinently, by a quotation from the O. T. purporting, that when the ſons of Iſrael were in the like perilous ſituation in a deſert, without the ordinary means of ſubſiſtence, God ſupplied them with food, by which their lives were preſerved (for it is not pretended that the manna ſerved as ſpiritual nouriſhment), to teach us that no ſtrait, however preſſing, ought to ſhake our confidence in him. Beau. and the anonymous Eng. tranſlator in 1729, exhibit the ſame ſenſe in their verſions.

6. *Leſt,* μηποτε. E. T, *Leſt at any time.* From an exceſſive ſolicitude, not to ſay leſs than the original, words have been explained from etymology, rather than from uſe; in conſequence of which practice, ſome verſions are encumbered with expletives, which enfeeble, inſtead of ſtrengthening, the expreſſion. Of this kind is the phraſe *at any time,* which, in this paſſage, adds nothing to the ſenſe. The compound μηποτε, in the uſe of the ſacred penmen, rarely ſignifies more than the ſimple μη, *leſt.* It is uſed by the Seventy in tranſlating a Heb. term that imports no more. In the Pſalm referred to, it is rendered ſimply *leſt.* And to go no farther than this Goſpel, our tranſlators have not heſitated to render it ſo in the following paſſages, vii. 6. xiii. 29. xv. 32. xxv. 9. xxvii. 64. Why they have not done ſo in this, and moſt other places, I can diſcover no good reaſon.

7. *Jeſus again anſwered, It is written,* εφη αυτω ὁ Ιησους παλιν γεγραπται. E. T. *Jeſus ſaid unto him, It is written again.* The words in the original are ſuſceptible of either interpretation, the difference depending entirely on the pointing. I place the comma after παλιν, they after Ιησους. This was the ſecond anſwer which Jeſus

Jeſus made on this occaſion to the devil. It is not eaſy to ſay in what ſenſe the words quoted can be ſaid to have been written again. The punctuation is not of divine authority, any more than the diviſion into chapters and verſes.

3. *Thou ſhalt not make trial of*, ουκ εκπειρασεις. E. T. *Thou ſhalt not tempt.* What we commonly mean by the word *tempting*, does not ſuit the ſenſe of the Gr. word εκπειραζω in this paſſage. The Eng. word means properly either *to ſolicit to evil*, or *to provoke;* whereas the import of the Gr. verb in this and ſeveral other places is *to aſſay, to try, to put to the proof.* It is thus the word is uſed, Gen. xxi. 1. where God is ſaid to have *tempted* Abraham, commanding him to offer up his ſon Iſaac for a burnt offering. God did not ſolicit the patriarch to evil, for, in this ſenſe, as the Apoſtle James tells us, i. 13. he neither can be tempted, nor tempteth any man. But God *tried* Abraham, as the word ought manifeſtly to have been rendered, putting his faith and obedience to the proof. His ready compliance, ſo far from being evil, was an evidence of the ſublimeſt virtue. It was in deſiring to have a proof of God's care of them, and preſence with them, that the children of Iſrael are ſaid to have *tempted the Lord at Maſſa*, ſaying, *Is the Lord among us or not?* And on the preſent occaſion it was God's love to him, and faithfulneſs in the performance of his promiſe, that the devil deſired our Lord, by throwing himſelf headlong from a precipice, to *make trial of.*

15. *On the Jordan*, περαν του Ιορδανου. E. T. *Beyond Jordan.* The Heb. word מעבר *megheber*, rendered by the Seventy περαν, ſignifies indifferently *on this ſide* or *on the other ſide.* In Num. xxxii. 19. the word is uſed in both meanings in the ſame ſentence. Unleſs therefore ſome other word or phraſe is added, as κατ' ανατολας, or κατα θαλασσαν, to aſcertain the ſenſe, it ought to be rendered as in the text, or as in verſe 25th. Zebulon and Naphtali were on the ſame ſide of the Jordan with Jeruſalem and Judea, where Iſaiah exerciſed his prophetical office.

15. *Near the ſea*, οδον θαλασσης. E. T. *By the way of the ſea.* This expreſſion is rather indefinite and obſcure. There is an ellipſis in the original, but I have given the ſenſe. What is here called *ſea* is properly not *a ſea*, but *a lake.* It was cuſtomary with the Hebrews to denominate a large extent of water, though freſh water, and encompaſſed with land, by the name *ſea.* Both Mt. and Mr. denominate this *the ſea of Galilee;* J. calls it *the ſea of Tiberias*; L. more properly *the lake of Genneſareth.* It was on this lake that Capernaum, and ſome other towns of note, were ſituated. Here alſo Peter and Andrew, James and John, before they were called to the apoſtleſhip, exerciſed the occupation of fiſhers. *The ſea of Galilee* and *the ſea of Tiberias* are become in ſcripture-ſtyle ſo much like proper names, that it might look affected to change them for *the lake of Galilee.* and *the lake of Tiberias.* Beſides, where it can conveniently be done, theſe ſmall differences in phraſeology which diverſify the ſtyles of the Evangeliſts in the original, ought to be preſerved in the tranſlation.

16. *A region of the ſhades of death*, χωρα και σκια θανατου. In the Sep. in the paſſage referred to, the words are χωρα σκιας θανατου, literally from the Heb. of the prophet, ארץ צל מות *arets ſal-moth. Tſal-moth*, it was obſerved, Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 2. and *ſheol*, are nearly ſynonymous, and anſwer to ᾅδης in the N. T. which ſignifies the inviſible world, or the ſtate of the dead. The expreſſion is here evidently metaphorical, and repreſents the ignorance or ſpiritual darkneſs in which the people of that region, who were intermixed with the heathen, lived, before they received the light of the Goſpel.

18. *A drag*, αμφιβληστρον. E. T. *A net.* The word is not the ſame here that is in verſe 20; there it is δικτυον, which I take to be the name of the genus, and properly rendered *net.* The name here is that of a ſpecies anſwering to what we call *a drag.* The ſame hiſtorian, xiii. 47. uſes the word σαγηνη, which in the common tranſlation is alſo rendered *net.* It is not very material, but neither ought it to be altogether overlooked, to make, when poſſible in a conſiſtency with propriety, the phraſeology of the verſion both as various and as ſpecial as that of the original. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 9—13.

21. *In the bark*, εν τω πλοιω. E. T. *In a ſhip*, L. v. 2. N.

21. *Mending*, καταρτιζοντας. Mr. i. 19. N.

CHAP. V.

3. *Happy*, μακαριοι. E. T. *Bleſſed.* I agree with thoſe tranſlators who chuſe generally to render μακαριος *happy*, ευλογητος and ευλογημενος *bleſſed.* The common verſion rarely makes a diſtinction.

3. *Happy the poor*, μακαριοι οι πτωχοι. E. T. *Bleſſed are the poor.* It has more energy in theſe aphoriſtical ſentences, after the example of the original, and all the ancient verſions, to omit the ſubſtantive verb. The idiom of our language admits this freedom as eaſily as the Itn. and more ſo than the Fr. None of the La. verſions expreſs the verb. Dio.'s Itn. does not; nor do the Fr. verſions of P. R. L. Cl. and Sa. Si. expreſſes it in the firſt beatitude, but not in the following ones. Another reaſon which induced me to adopt this manner is to render theſe aphoriſms, in regard to happineſs, as ſimilar in form as they are in the original, to the aphoriſms in regard to wretchedneſs, which are, L. vi. contraſted with them, *wo to you that are rich*— for I ſhall ſhow, in the note on that paſſage, that the verb to be ſupplied is in the indicative mood equally in both.

3. *Happy the poor who repine not*, μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι. E. T. *Bleſſed are the poor in ſpirit.* I have aſſigned my reaſon, Diſſ. XI. P. I. § 18. for thinking that it is as much the buſineſs of a tranſlator to tranſlate phraſes as to tranſlate words. An idiomatic phraſe ſtands

ſtands preciſely on the footing with a compound word. The meaning is commonly learnt from the uſual application of the whole word, or of the whole phraſe, and not by the detached meanings of the ſeveral parts, which, in another language, conjoined, in the ſame manner, may convey either no meaning at all, or a meaning very different from the author's. Such, in a particular manner, is the meaning which the phraſe *poor in ſpirit* naturally conveys to Engliſh ears. *Poor-ſpirited*, which to appearance is coincident with it, is always employed in a bad ſenſe, and denotes mean, daſtardly, ſervile. *Poorneſs of ſpirit* is the ſame ill quality in the abſtract. The phraſe, therefore, in our language, if it can be ſaid to ſuggeſt any ſenſe, ſuggeſts one very different from the ſenſe of the text. In ſupport of the interpretation here given, let the following things be attended to: Firſt, that it is literally *the poor* that is meant, may be fairly concluded from the parallel place, L. vi. 20. where the like declaration is pronounced of *the poor* ſimply, without any limitation, as in this paſſage. And this is of conſiderable weight, whether we conſider the diſcourſe recorded by L. as the ſame, or different, ſince their coincidence in many things, and ſimilarity in others, is confeſſed on all ſides. Now what puts it beyond a doubt, that it is *the poor* in the proper ſenſe that is meant there, is the characters contraſted to thoſe pronounced *happy*. Theſe begin v. 24. *Woe unto you that are rich*. It is alſo not without its weight, that our Lord begins with this on both occaſions; but eſpecially that the ſame beatitude is aſcribed to both: *Theirs is the kingdom of heaven*. I might urge further that, if *the poor* be not meant here, there is none of theſe maxims that relates to them. Now this omiſſion is very improbable, in uſhering in the laws of a diſpenſation which was entitled, many ages before, *glad tidings to the poor;* to announce which was one great end of the Meſſiah's miſſion. And the fulfilment of this prophecy in him, is what our Lord fails not to obſerve on more occaſions than one. I cannot therefore agree with Wh and others, in thinking that πτωχοι τω πνευματι means humble. The quotations produced by that critic, in ſupport of his opinion, are more foreign to his purpoſe than any thing I have yet diſcovered in his learned Commentaries. "The uſual expreſſion," ſays he, "by which the Scriptures [meaning the O. T.] "and the Jewiſh writers repreſent the humble man is, "that he is *ſhephal ruach*, i. e. poor, low, or contrite "in his ſpirit." And of this he brings ſome examples. It is true, the meaning of *ſhephal* is humble, and of *ruach* is ſpirit. But becauſe, in Scripture, men humble of ſpirit means humble men, muſt therefore *the poor in ſpirit* alſo mean humble men? To make the inconcluſiveneſs of this reaſoning paſs unobſerved, he has inſerted the word *poor*, amongſt others in his explanation of the word *ſhephal*. But that it ever means *poor*, I have not found ſo much as a ſingle example. It is never tranſlated by the ſeventy πτωχος; but either ταπεινος, or by ſome word of like import. As to the phraſe *ſhephal ruach*, it occurs but thrice in Scripture. In one place it is rendered πραυθυμος, in another ταπεινοφρων, and in the third ολιγοψυχος. Should any object, that to exclude *the humble* from a place here, will ſeem as unſuitable to the temper of our religion, as to exclude *the poor;* I anſwer, that I underſtand *the humble* to be comprehended under the third beatitude: *Happy the meek*. Not that I look upon the two words as ſtrictly ſynonymous, but as expreſſing the ſame diſpoſition under different aſpects; *humility*, in the contemplation of ſelf as in the divine preſence; *meekneſs*, as regarding the conduct towards other men. This temper is accordingly oppoſed to pride as well as to anger. The words ſeem to have been often uſed indiſcriminately. *Humble* in the Heb. is once and again by the Seventy rendered *meek*, and converſely; and they are ſometimes ſo quoted in the N. T. Nay, the very phraſe for *lowly in ſpirit*, above criticiſed, *ſhephal ruach*, is at one time rendered πραυθυμος, *meek ſpirited*, at another ταπεινοφρων, *humble*. But ſhould it be aſked, what then does τω πνευματι add to the ſenſe of οι πτω οι; I think the phraſe to which Wh. recurs will furniſh us with an anſwer. *Shephal* is properly ταπεινος, *humilis;* the addition of *ruach* is equivalent to τω πνευματι. Such an addition therefore as is made to the ſenſe of ταπεινος in the one phraſe by τω πνευματι, ſuch alſo is made to the ſenſe of πτωχος in the other, by the ſame words ſuperadded. It may be thought that no addition is made to the firſt, the ſimple term ταπεινος expreſſing a quality of the mind; but this is a miſtake ariſing from the application of the Eng. word *humble*, which does not entirely coincide with the aforeſaid terms in the ancient tongues. In all theſe the word properly refers to meanneſs of condition. In the few inſtances wherein ταπεινος ſignifies *humble*, and ταπεινωσις *humility*, there may be juſtly ſaid to be an elliptis of τη καρδια or τω πνευματι. The proper word for *humble* is ταπεινοφρων, for *humility* ταπεινοφροσυνη. As therefore ταπεινοφρων, ταπεινος τη καρδια, and ταπεινος τω πνευματι (for this expreſſion alſo occurs in the Sep. Pſ. xxxiii. 19.), denote one whoſe mind is ſuited to the lowneſs of his ſtation, ſo πτωχος τω πνευματι denotes one whoſe mind is ſuited to the poorneſs of his circumſtances. As the former imports unambitious, unaſpiring after worldly honours or the applauſe of men; the latter imports unrepining, not covetous of earthly treaſure, eaſily ſatisfied, content with little. This and humility are indeed kindred virtues, but not the ſame.

Wet. is ſingular in thinking that the words ought to be conſtrued thus: μακαριοι τω πνευματι—οι πτωχοι. He underſtands πνευμα to mean the Spirit of God, and renders it into La. *Beati Spiritui pauperes;* as if we ſhould ſay, *Happy in the Spirit's account are the poor*. He urges that πτωχοι τω πνευματι is unexampled. But is it more ſo than μακαριοι τω πνευματι? Or do we find any thing in Scripture analogous to this phraſe in the manner he has explained it? I have ſhown that there is at leaſt one phraſe, ταπεινος τω πνευματι, perfectly ſimilar to the other, which may well ſerve to explain it, and remove his other objection, that it ought to mean a bad quality. Beſides, I would aſk, whether we are to underſtand in verſe 8th, τη καρδια as likewiſe conſtrued with μακα-

μοι]

ριοι; for nothing can be more ſimilar than the expreſſions μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι and μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια?

5. *They ſhall inherit*, αυτοι κληρονομησουσι. Vul. *Ipſi poſſidebunt*. The La. word *poſſidebunt* ſufficiently correſponds to the Gr. κληρονομησουσι; which generally denotes poſſeſſing by any title, by lot, ſucceſſion, purchaſe, conqueſt, or gift; I therefore think that Caſ. judged better in following the Vul. than Be. who expreſſes the ſentiment by a circumlocution which appears too poſitively to exclude poſſeſſion of every other kind. *Ipſi terram hæreditario jure obtinebunt*. But as the ſpeciality which the word ſometimes conveys may be expreſſed more ſimply in Eng. I have with the common verſion preferred *inherit* to *poſſeſs*. It happily accords to the ſtyle of the N. T. in regard both to the preſent privileges and to the future proſpects of God's people. They are here denominated *ſons of God*; *and if ſons*, as the Apoſtle argues, *then heirs, heirs of God, and coheirs with Chriſt*. The future recompenſe is called *a birth-right, an inheritance*. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 17.

5. *The land*, την γην. E. T. *The earth*. That the word is ſuſceptible of either ſenſe cannot be doubted. The queſtion is, which is the genuine ſenſe in this paſſage? Let it be obſerved, that it had, long before then, become cuſtomary, among the moſt enlightened of the Jewiſh nation, to adopt the phraſeology which the ſacred writers had employed, in reference to ceremonial obſervances and temporal promiſes, and to affix to the words a more ſublime meaning, as referring to moral qualities, and to eternal benefits. This might be illuſtrated, if neceſſary, from many paſſages of the N. T. as well as from the oldeſt Jewiſh writers. The expreſſion under examination is an inſtance, being a quotation from Pſ. xxxvii. 11. Now, in order to determine the ſenſe of the word here, its meaning there ſhould firſt be aſcertained. Every perſon converſant in the Heb. knows that the word there uſed (and the ſame may be ſaid of the Gr. and La. words by which it is rendered) ſometimes means *the earth*, ſometimes a particular *land* or country. Commonly the context, or ſome epithet, or the words in conſtruction, remove the ambiguity. That, in the paſſage referred to, it ſignifies *the land* namely Canaan, promiſed to the Patriarchs, is hardly called in queſtion. As for *the earth*, it was given, ſays the Pſalmiſt, to the children of men; even the idolatrous and profane were not excluded. Whereas this peculiar, this much favoured *land*, God reſerved for the patrimony of Iſrael, whom he honoured with the title of *his ſon, his firſt born*. To this the ancient promiſes given to the Iſraelites had all a manifeſt reference. It is true, our tranſlators have rendered the word, in the paſſage of the Pſalms alluded to, *the earth*, merely, I imagine, that it might be conformable to what they underſtood to be the ſenſe of the expreſſion in this place. A ſtrong proof of this is that they have obſerved no uniformity in their manner of tranſlating it, in this very Pſalm. The word occurs ſix times. Thrice they tranſlate it *the land*, and thrice *the earth*. Yet there is not the ſhadow of a reaſon for this variation; for no two things can be more ſimilar than the expreſſions ſo differently rendered. Thus, v. 11. *The meek ſhall inherit the earth*; v. 29. *The righteous ſhall inherit the land*. Indeed nothing can be plainer to one who reads the ſacred ode with attention, than that it ought to be rendered *land* throughout the whole. Peace, ſecurity, and plenty, in *the land* which the Lord their God had given them, are the purport of all the promiſes it contains. 'But,' it may be ſaid, 'admit 'this were the meaning of the Pſalmiſt, are we to 'imagine that the evangelical promiſe given by our 'Lord, is to be confined, in the ſame manner, to the 'poſſeſſion of the earthly Canaan?' By no means. Nevertheleſs our Lord's promiſe, as he manifeſtly intended, ought to be expreſſed in the ſame terms. The new covenant, which God hath made with us by Jeſus Chriſt, is founded on better promiſes than that which he made with the Iſraelites by Moſes. But then, the promiſes, as well as the other parts of the Moſaic covenant, are the figures or ſhadows, as the writer to the Hebrews well obſerves (ch. x. 1.), of the correſponding parts of the Chriſtian covenant. Even the holy men under that diſpenſation were taught by the Spirit to uſe the ſame language, in regard to bleſſings infinitely ſuperior to thoſe to which the terms had been originally appropriated. David warns the people in his time of the danger of provoking God, to ſwear concerning them, as he had ſworn concerning their fathers in the deſert, that they ſhould not enter into his reſt. Yet the people were at that very time in poſſeſſion of Canaan, the promiſed reſt, and conſequently could not be affected by the threat, in the ordinary acceptation of the words. Hence the aforecited author juſtly concludes (ch. iv. 9.), that the inſpired penman muſt have had in his view another reſt, which ſtill remains for the people of God, and from which men's diſobedience may ſtill prove the cauſe of their excluſion. Moſes had his *land* of promiſe, with the proſpect of which he rouſed the Iſraelites. Jeſus Chriſt alſo has his, with the hope of which he encourages and ſtimulates his diſciples. That it is the heavenly happineſs that is meant, appears to me certain (for all the promiſes here relate to things ſpiritual and eternal), but ſtill conveyed under thoſe typical expreſſions to which his hearers had been habituated. The Rh. in Eng. and L. Cl. in Fr. are the only tranſlators into modern languages with whoſe verſions I am acquainted, who have expreſſed this properly. L. Cl. ſays, *ils poſſederont le païs*. At the ſame time his note on the place ſhews that he miſunderſtood the ſenſe. He ſuppoſed this declaration to relate ſolely to thoſe Jews converted to Chriſtianity, who, after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the ſubverſion of the Jewiſh polity, by the Romans, were allowed to live peaceably in the country, becauſe they had taken no part in the war. Theſe ſentences with which our Lord's doctrine is introduced, are to be regarded not as particular predictions, but as univerſal axioms. All thoſe who fall within the deſcription, *the poor, the meek, the merciful*, in any age or country, are entitled to the

promiſe. It is impoſſible that they ſhould have been underſtood otherwiſe at the time, by any hearer. The general tenor of the expreſſions uſed, unlimited by any circumſtance of time or place, eſpecially when compared with the ſcope and tendency of the whole diſcourſe, ſhews manifeſtly that they are to be held as the fundamental principles of the new diſpenſation to be introduced by the Meſſiah. Beſides, all the other promiſes are confeſſedly ſuch as ſuit the nature of the kingdom, which is declared by its founder and ſovereign to be *not of this world*. How unreaſonable is it then to think that this muſt be underſtood as an exception? Indeed ſome who render την γην *the earth*, acknowledge that heaven is meant. But how vague and arbitrary muſt this way of expounding appear, when we conſider that *heaven* is in this very diſcourſe contraſted to *earth*, and diſtinguiſhed from it? That our Lord's ſtyle is often figurative is not to be denied. But the figures are not taken at random, nor to be interpreted by every body's fancy. They are adopted according to certain rules eaſily diſcoverable from an acquaintance with holy writ, and the Jewiſh laws and ceremonies. And of thoſe rules, none is more common than that which aſſigns a ſpiritual and ſublime meaning to expreſſions in the law which relates merely to external rites and temporal benefits. (See the N. on v. 8.) I ſhall only add, that all theſe promiſes are in effect the ſame, but preſented under ſuch different aſpects as ſuit the different characters recommended. Thus *a kingdom* is promiſed to *the poor*, *conſolation* to *the mourners*, *an inheritance* to *the meek*, who are liable here to be diſpoſſeſſed of every thing, by the aſpiring and the violent; and ſo of the reſt.

6. *Who hunger and thirſt for righteouſneſs*, οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην. In the ordinary interpretation *to hunger and thirſt* denotes to have an ardent deſire. Maldonate was of opinion that the words ought rather to be rendered *who hunger and thirſt becauſe of righteouſneſs*; that is, whoſe righteouſneſs or integrity has occaſioned their being reduced to ſuch a ſtate of indigence. His reaſons for this expoſition are as follows: 1ſt, That they who are in the literal ſenſe hungry and thirſty are here meant, there is reaſon to preſume from the parallel paſſage in L. where the words are, *Ye who hunger now*, without the addition of righteouſneſs, or any word correſponding to it. 2dly, Though *thirſt* is by the ſacred authors often uſed metaphorically for the deſire of ſpiritual good things, there is not any clear example that *hunger* is ever ſo applied. 3dly, Each of theſe declarations, commonly called beatitudes, regards a particular virtue, and not a virtuous character in general. I acknowledge that the firſt is the only one of theſe reaſons which appears to me to have any weight. As to the ſecond, a ſingle inſtance of a metaphorical application, when plain from the context, is ſufficient evidence. Beſides, though *hunger* ſimply is not uſed by metaphor for the deſire of ſpiritual things, themſelves are repreſented by *bread* and by *meat*, as well as by *drink* (Iſ. lv. 1, 2. J. vi. 27.); and our participation in them is repreſented by *eating* as well as by *drinking* (J. vi. 50. 1 Cor. v. 2.). *Hunger* here therefore, coupled with *thirſt*, may be accounted ſufficiently explicit for expreſſing ſtrong deſire of ſpiritual things, in like manner as *eating* coupled with *drinking* denote an ample participation in them. In tropes ſo cloſely related, the ſenſe of one aſcertains the ſenſe of the other. As to the third reaſon, though righteouſneſs is uſed to denote the whole of practical religion, *to hunger and thirſt for righteouſneſs* may not improperly be ſaid to expreſs one particular quality only, to wit, a zeal for higher attainments in virtue and piety. The declaration in v. 10th may, in one view, be conſidered as equally general with this, and in another, as regarding ſolely the virtue of perſeverance or conſtancy. But what principally weighs with me is, firſt, the conſideration that the common interpretation appears to have been the univerſal interpretation of the earlieſt ages. This is a ſtrong preſumption that it is the moſt natural and beſt ſuited to the conſtruction. 2dly, The omiſſion of the prepoſition δια, on Maldonate's hypotheſis, is not at all ſuited to the ſtyle of theſe writers; but that διψαω is ſometimes uſed actively, and governs the accuſative of that which is the object of our thirſt, we are authoriſed by Phavorinus to aſſert: συντασσεται, ſays that lexicographer, αιτιατικῃ και γενικῃ, αιτιατικῃ μεν, ως το, ἐδίψησε σε ἡ ψυχη μου, και διψω τας λογους. The former of theſe examples is quoted from Pſ. lxii. 2. anſwering to lxiii. 1. in the Engliſh Bible, which follows the Maſoretic Heb. *My ſoul thirſteth for thee*. The paſſage appears in the ſame form in Trommius' Concordance, on the verb διψαω. Yet in the common editions of the Sep. the pronoun is σει not σε. But that the accuſative is ſometimes uſed as well as the dative and the genitive, is manifeſt from Wiſd. xi. 14. ᾗ' ὁμοιᾳ δικαιοις διψησαντες. Beſides, the ſenſe which Maldonate gives, is included in v. 10. and this I think a ſtrong objection to it.

8. *The clean in heart* οι καθαροι τη καρδια. E. T. *The pure in heart*. I admit that this is a juſt expreſſion of the ſenſe, and more in the Eng. idiom than mine. My only reaſon for preferring a more literal verſion of the word καθαρος here is, becauſe I would, in all ſuch inſtances, preſerve the alluſion to be found in the moral maxims of the N. T. to the ancient ritual, from which the metaphors of the ſacred writers, and their other tropes, are frequently borrowed, and to which they owe much of their luſtre and energy. The laws in regard to the cleanneſs of the body, and even of the garments, if neglected by any perſon, excluded him from the temple. He was incapacitated for being ſo much as a ſpectator of the ſolemn ſervice at the altar. The Jews conſidered the empyreal heaven as the architype of the temple of Jeruſalem. In the latter, they enjoyed the ſymbols of God's preſence, who ſpoke to them by his miniſters; whereas, in the former, the bleſſed inhabitants have an immediate ſenſe of the divine preſence, and God ſpeaks to them face to face. Our Lord, preſerving the analogy between the

two diſpenſations, intimates that *cleanneſs* will be as neceſſary in order to procure admiſſion into the celeſtial temple, as into the terreſtrial. But as the privilege is inconceivably higher, the qualification is more important. The cleanneſs is not ceremonial, but moral; not of the outward man, but of the inward. The ſame idea is ſuggeſted, Pſ. xxiv. When ſuch alluſions appear in the original, they ought, if poſſible, to have a place in the verſion.

9. *The peacemakers*, οι ειρηνοποιοι. Some render it *the pacific*; ſome *the peaceable*. Weakly both. With us theſe words imply merely a negative quality, and are equivalent to *not contentious, not quarrelſome, not litigious*. More is compriſed here. This word is not found in any other part of Scripture, but (which is nearly the ſame) the verb ειρηνοποιεω of the ſame origin occurs, Col. i. 20. where the connection ſhews that it cannot ſignify to be gentle, to be peaceable, but actively to reconcile, *to make peace*. Etymology and claſſical uſe alſo concur in affixing the ſenſe of *reconciler, peacemaker*, ειρηνοποιος. It is likewiſe ſo explained by Chryſoſtom. Indeed, if no more were meant by it than thoſe pacifically diſpoſed, nothing additional, would be given here, to what is implied in the firſt and third of theſe characters; for as theſe exclude covetouſneſs, ambition, anger, and pride, they remove all the ſources of war, contention, and ſtrife. Now, though all theſe characters given by our Lord are cloſely related, they are ſtill diſtinct.

11. *Proſecute*, διωξωσι. E. T. *Perſecute*. Some critics think, not improbaby, that the word in this place relates to the proſecutions of the diſciples (to whom Jeſus here directly addreſſes himſelf) on account of their religion, before human tribunals, whereof he often warned them on other occaſions. In this verſe he deſcends to particulars, diſtinguiſhing διωκειν from ονειδιζειν, and ειπειν παν πονηρον ρημα, which ſeem alſo to be uſed in reference to judicial proceedings. In the preceding verſe, and in the following, there can be no doubt that the verb is uſed in the utmoſt latitude, and ought to be rendered *perſecute*. See alſo ch. x. 23. xxiii. 34.

15. *A lamp*, λυχνον. E. T. *A candle*. The meaning of the word is *lamp* Candles were not uſed at that time in Judea for lighting their houſes. Λυχνια conſequently means a lamp-ſtand, not a candleſtick.

[2] *Under a corn meaſure*, υπο τον μοδιον. E. T. *Under a buſhel*. But they had no ſuch meaſure. And though it is true that any meaſure of capacity will ſuit the obſervation, a tranſlator ought not, even indirectly, to miſrepreſent the cuſtoms of the people. The meaſure mentioned by the Evangeliſt, ſo far from anſwering to our *buſhel*, was leſs than our *peck*. But as nothing here depends on the capacity of the meaſure, it is better to adopt the general term, than to introduce uncouth names, without neceſſity. Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 6.

[3] As to the article prefixed to μοδιον and λυχνιαν, Sc. ſays, "Obſerve how the article loſes its emphaſis, and "is rendered *a* inſtead of *the*." I admit that the article may be in ſome caſes redundant, but not that we have an example of its redundancy here. Is it not our conſtant way, when we name any utenſil whereof there is but one of the kind in the houſe, to uſe the definite article? "Bring me *the* balance, that I may weigh "this." "Take *the* buſhel, and mete the grain." And even when there are more than one, if one be ſuperior in value to the reſt, or in more frequent uſe, it is commonly diſtinguiſhed in the ſame manner. On the contrary, when there are more of a kind, and no one diſtinguiſhed from the reſt, we expreſs ourſelves indefinitely, as, "Give me *a* ſpoon:" "Set *a* chair for Mr. "Such-a-one." Our Lord's ſimilitude is taken from the cuſtoms of families. He therefore uſes the ſtyle which would be uſed in any houſe. This explains ſufficiently why he ſays *a lamp*, as probably moſt houſes had more than one, but *the modius*, there being but one, and *the ſtand*, as one might be in more frequent uſe than the reſt, for the accommodation of the family. However, as the ſenſe is ſufficiently expreſſed either way, I have preferred the indefinite manner in my verſion, being better adapted to the more general terms I was obliged to adopt. See N. on ch. xxvii. 61.

17. *To ſubvert the law or the prophets*, καταλυσαι τον νομον η τους προφητας. E. T. *To deſtroy*. Of the different ſenſes which have been aſſigned to the verb καταλυσαι, one is, when applied to a law, *to break* or *violate*. Though this is the ſenſe of the ſimple verb λυω, v. 19. it cannot be the ſenſe of the compound here. Nobody could ſuppoſe that it needed a divine miſſion to qualify one to tranſgreſs the law, which ſo many, merely from the depravity of their own minds, flagrantly did every day. Another ſenſe, which ſuits better the context, is authoritatively *to repeal* or *abrogate*. This appears proper as applied to the law, but harſh as applied to the prophets, though by the prophets are meant, by a common metonymy, the prophetical writings. But even theſe we never ſpeak of aboliſhing or abrogating. *To deſtroy* is rather ſaying too much, and is more in the military ſtyle than in the legiſlative. If every copy and ſcrap of theſe writings were obliterated or burnt, we could not ſay more than that they were deſtroyed. The context, in my opinion, ſhews that the import of the word here is not directly to reſcind or repeal, but indirectly to ſuperſede a ſtanding rule by the ſubſtitution of another; which, though it does not formally *annul* the preceding, may be ſaid in effect *to ſubvert* it. This appears fully to expreſs the ſenſe, and is equally adapted to both terms, the law and the prophets.

[2] *But to ratify*, αλλα πληρωσαι. E. T. *But to fulfil*. The ſenſe of the verb πληρω is aſcertained by καταλυω. We have ſeen that the meaning of this word cannot be *to break*, and therefore it is highly probable that the other means more than *to obey*. The proper oppoſite of weakening and ſubverting a law is *confirming* and *ratifying* it. See N. on ch. iii. 15. Some of great name tranſlate it here *to complete*, perfect, or fill up, and think it alludes to the precepts, as it were, ſuperadded in this diſcourſe. I own there is a plauſibility in this explana-

tion;

tion; ſome of our Lord's precepts being, to appearance, improvements on the law. Yet I cannot help thinking, that theſe divine ſayings are to be regarded rather as explanatory of the law, in ſhowing its extent and ſpirituality, than as additions to it, not binding on men before, but deriving their power to oblige, purely from their promulgation by Jeſus Chriſt. Beſides, I find no example of the ſenſe *to fill up* in any paſſage that can be reckoned analogous to the preſent. For the phraſe *fill up the meaſure of your fathers* cannot ſurely be accounted of the number. The word *meaſure* there leaves no room to heſitate. It is otherwiſe here. The interpretation, *make fully known*, given by Benſon (Eſſay concerning aboliſhing of the Ceremonial Law, ch. ii. ſect. 2.), though not implauſible, does not make ſo exact a contraſt to the preceding word *ſubvert*, nor is it, in this application, ſo well eſtabliſhed by uſe.

18. *Verily, I ſay unto you* αμην λεγω υμιν. As Mt. has retained the Heb. word *amen* in ſuch affirmations, and is in this followed by the other Evangeliſts, though leſs frequently by L. than by the reſt, it is not improper here, where the word firſt occurs, to enquire into its import. Its proper ſignification is *true*, *verus*, as ſpoken of things, *obſervant of truth*, *verax*, as ſpoken of perſons, ſometimes *truth* in the abſtract. In the O. T. it is ſometimes uſed adverbially, denoting a concurrence in any wiſh or prayer, and is rendered by the Seventy γενοιτο, *ſo be it*. In this application the word has been adopted into moſt European languages. In the N. T. it is frequently uſed in affirmation. Now as L. has been more ſparing than the other Evangeliſts, in the uſe of this Oriental term, it is worth while to obſerve, when he is relating the ſame paſſages of our Lord's hiſtory with them, what word he has ſubſtituted for the *amen* uſed by them, as this will ſhow in what manner he underſtood the Heb. adverb. The ſame prediction which in Mt. xvi. 8. is uſhered in by the words αμην λεγω υμιν is thus introduced, L. ix. 27. λεγω υμιν αληθως, which anſwers to *truly* or *verily* with us. Another example of this interpretation we find, on comparing Mr. xii. 43. with L. xxi. 3. The only other example, in paſſages entirely parallel, is Mt. xxiii. 36. and L. xi. 51. where the αμην of the former is, by the latter, rendered by the affirmative adverb ναι. I have not obſerved any paſſage in the O. T. wherein the word *amen* is uſed in affirming; and therefore I conſider this idiom in the Goſpels as more properly a Syriaſm than a Hebraiſm. Indeed ſome derivatives from *amen* often occur in affirmation. Such as *amenah*, Gen. xx. 12. Joſ. vii. 20. rendered in the Sep. αληθως. Such alſo is *amenam*, which occurs oftner, and is rendered αληθως, επ' αληθειας, εν αληθεια, or ουτως, exactly correſponding to the application made of αμην in the Goſpels. This is as ſtrong evidence of the import of this word in the N. T. as the nature of the thing will admit. Nor does there appear the ſhadow of a reaſon for the opinion maintained by ſome critics that, when uſed thus, it is of the nature of an oath. It is true that to ſwear by the God of truth, *elohe-amen*, is mentioned (Iſ. lxv. 16.) as an oath; and ſo doubtleſs would it be to ſwear *by the God of knowledge* or *by the God of power*. But does any body conclude hence, that the words knowledge and power, whereſoever found, or howſoever applied, include an oath? It has alſo been urged, that in the trial of jealouſy the woman is ſaid to be charged with an oath of curſing (Num. v. 22.), when all that was required of her was to ſay, *amen*, *amen*, to the imprecation pronounced upon her by the prieſt in caſe ſhe was guilty of the crime ſuſpected. This was doubtleſs an imprecation and an oath, for *amen*, ſaid in that manner, was equivalent to the repetition of the words ſpoken by the prieſt. Should the magiſtrate in an Eng. judicatory (where the oath adminiſtered to witneſſes is ſtill in the form of an imprecation) rehearſe the words, concluding as uſual, *ſo help you God*, and require of the witneſs only to ſay *amen*, it would be juſtly termed an oath, and an imprecation againſt himſelf, if he gave a falſe teſtimony. But does any man conclude hence that *amen* implies either oath or imprecation, when he ſubjoins it to prayers for health and ſafety? This character does not reſult from any ſingle word, but from the ſcope and ſtructure of the whole ſentence.

Yet a critic of no leſs eminence than Father Si. after tranſlating properly αμην λεγω υμιν, Mr. viii. 12. *je vous aſſure*, ſubjoins in a note, *autrement je vous jure*. With how little reaſon this note is added, let the judicious reader determine. Our Lord often recurs to this ſolemn form of aſſeveration in this diſcourſe upon the Mount, where he expreſsly forbids his diſciples the uſe of oaths in their intercourſe with one another. How would it have ſounded from him to addreſs them in this manner, 'Swear not in any form, but let your anſwer to what is aſked be ſimply yes or no; for I ſwear to you, that whatever exceedeth theſe proceedeth from evil?' How would this ſuit the harmony which ſo eminently ſubſiſts between his precepts and example? In fact, his ſolemn manner was calculated to impreſs the hearers with a ſenſe, not ſo much, of the reality, as of the importance, of what was affirmed; the aim was more to rouſe attention than enforce belief.

2. *One iota*, ιωτα εν. E. T. *One jot*. I thought it better here, with moſt Itn. and Fr. tranſlators, to retain the Gr. word than to employ a term which, if it have a meaning, hardly differs in meaning from the word *tittle* immediately following. This could be the leſs objected againſt, as our tranſlators have oftner than once introduced the name of two other Gr. letters, *alpha* and *omega*, in the Apocalypſe.

3. *Without attaining its end*, εως αν γενηται. L. ii. 2. N.

19. *Violate*, λυση. It is evident that the ſenſe of the ſimple λυω is not here the ſame with that of the compound καταλυω in v. 17th. The verbs contraſted are different, καταλυω to πληροω, λυω to ποιεω. With regard to laws, the oppoſite to ſubverting is ratifying, to violating is practiſing. This is a further evidence that more is meant in v. 17th by πληροω than barely

obeying. And of the ſenſe I have given it, we have here an actual example. For what tends more to ratify a law than additional ſanctions, with which it was not formerly enforced?

19. *Or*, και. E. T. *And.* This is one of the caſes wherein the copulative has the force of a disjunctive. The conjunction does but ſave the repetition of a common clauſe, which belongs ſeverally to the words coupled. This remark will be better underſtood by reſolving the ſentence into the parts, whereof it is an abridged expreſſion. Whoever ſhall violate theſe commandments, ſhall be in no eſteem in the reign of heaven; and whoever ſhall teach others to violate them, ſhall be in no eſteem, &c. Here the ſenſe, with the aid of the copulative, is evidently the ſame with that expreſſed disjunctively in the verſion. One reaſon, beſide the ſcope of the paſſage, for underſtanding the conjunction in this manner is becauſe the verbs λυση and διδαξη are ſeparated in the original, each having its regimen. Ος εαν ουν λυση μιαν των εντολων——και διδαξη ουτω τους ανθρωπους. Conſequently the και is not to be underſtood disjunctively in the end of the verſe, where the verbs are more intimately connected, ος δ' αν ποιηση και διδαξη.

3. *Were it the leaſt of theſe commandments*, μιαν των εντολων τουτων των ελαχιστων. E. T. *One of theſe leaſt commandments.* But if the commandments here mentioned were Chriſt's *leaſt commandments*, what, it may be aſked, were *the greateſt?* or, Why have we no examples of the greateſt? That this phraſe is not to be ſo underſtood, our tranſlators themſelves have ſhewn by their way of rendering ch. xxv. 40. 45. The clauſe muſt therefore be explained as if arranged in this manner—μιαν των ελαχιστων των εντολων τουτων, the three laſt words being the regimen of the adjective, and not in concord with it.

4. *Shall be in no eſteem in the reign of heaven—ſhall be highly eſteemed*, ελαχιστος κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια των ουρανων——ουτος μεγας κληθησεται. E. T. *He ſhall be called the leaſt in the kingdom of heaven—he ſhall be called great.* To be called great and to be called little, for to be eſteemed and to be diſeſteemed, is ſo obvious a metonymy of the effect for the cauſe, that it naturally ſuggeſts itſelf to every diſcerning reader. By rendering therefore βασιλεια των ουρανων, agreeably to its meaning in moſt places, *the reign of heaven*, that is, the Goſpel diſpenſation, there is not the ſmalleſt difficulty in the paſſage. But if this phraſe be rendered *the kingdom of heaven*, as referring to the ſtate of the bleſſed, and if *he ſhall be called the leaſt in that kingdom* mean, as ſome explain it, *he ſhall never be admitted into it*, a moſt unnatural figure of ſpeech is introduced, whereof I do not recollect to have ſeen an example in any author, ſacred or profane.

20. *Excel*, περισσευση. E. T. *Exceed.* The original word expreſſes a ſuperiority either in quantity or in kind. The latter difference ſuits the context at leaſt as well as the former.

21. *That it was ſaid to the ancients*, οτι ερρεθη τοις αρχαιοις. E. T. *That it was ſaid by them of old time.* Be. *Dictum fuiſſe a veteribus.* Be. was the firſt interpreter of the N. T. who made the ancients thoſe by whom, and not thoſe to whom, the ſentences here quoted were ſpoken. Theſe other La. verſions, the Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Caſ. Cal. and Piſc. are all againſt him. Among the Proteſtant tranſlators into modern tongues, Be. whoſe work was much in vogue with the reformed, had his imitators. Dio. in Itn. rendered it *che fu detto dagli antichi*; the G. F. *qu'il a été dit par les anciens.* So alſo the common Eng. But all the Eng. verſions of an older date, even that executed at Geneva, ſay *to them of old time.* Lu. in like manner, in his Ger. tranſlation ſays, zu den alten. I have a Proteſtant tranſlation in Itn. and Fr. publiſhed by Giovan Luigi Paſchale in 1555, the year before the firſt edition of Be.'s (the place not mentioned), which renders it in the ſame way with all preceding tranſlators, without exception, *à gli antichi* and *aux anciens.* All the late tranſlators, Fr. and Eng. have returned to the uniform ſenſe of antiquity, rendering it *to*, not *by*, the ancients. For the meaning of a word or phraſe, which frequently occurs in ſcripture, the firſt recourſe ought to be to the ſacred writers, eſpecially the writer of the book where the paſſage occurs. Now the verb ρεω (and the ſame may be obſerved of its ſynonymas) in the paſſive voice, where the ſpeaker or ſpeakers are mentioned, has uniformly the ſpeaker in the genitive caſe, preceded by the prepoſition υπο or δια. And in no book does this oftner than in Mt. See ch. ii. 15. 17. 23. iii. 13. iv. 14. viii. 17. xii. 17. xiii. 35. xxi. 4, xxiv. 15. xxvii. 9. xxii. 31. In this laſt we have an example both of thoſe to whom, and of him by whom, the thing was ſaid, the former in the dative, the latter in the genitive with the prepoſition υπο. When the perſons ſpoken to are mentioned, they are invariably in the dative. Rom. ix. 12. 26. Gal. iii. 16. Apoc. vi. 11. ix. 4. With ſuch a number of examples on one ſide (yet theſe are not all), and not one from Scripture on the oppoſite, I ſhould think it very aſſuming in a tranſlator, without the leaſt neceſſity, to reject the expoſition given by all who had preceded him. It has been pleaded that ſomething like an example has been found in the conſtruction of one or two other verbs, neither ſynonymous nor related in meaning. Thus προς το θεασθηναι αυτοις, ch. vi. 1. means to be ſeen by them. Θεαομαι in Gr. anſwers to *videor* in La. And the argument would be equally ſtrong in regard to La. to ſay, becauſe *viſum eſt illis* ſignifies *it appeared to them*, that is, *it was ſeen by them*; *dictum eſt illis* muſt alſo ſignify *it was ſaid by them.* The authority of Herodotus (who wrote in a ſtyle ſomewhat reſembling, but in a dialect exceedingly unlike, that of the N. T.), in regard to a word in frequent uſe in Scripture, appears to me of no conceivable weight in the queſtion. Nor can any thing account for ſuch a palpable violence done the ſacred text, by a man of Be.'s knowledge, but that he had too much of the polemic ſpirit (the epidemical diſeaſe of his time) to be in all reſpects a faithful tranſlator. Diſſ. IX. P. V. § 5.

22. *Un-*

22. *Unjuſtly,* εικη. This word is wanting in two MSS. one of them the Vat. of great antiquity. There is no word anſwering to it in the Vul. nor in the Eth. Sax. and Ara. verſions, at leaſt in the copies of the Ara. tranſcribed in the Polyglots, which Rd. Si. obſerves to have been corrected on the Vul. and which are conſequently of no authority as evidences. Jerom rejected it, imagining it to be an interpolation of ſome tranſcriber deſirous to ſoften the rigour of the ſentiment, and in this opinion he was followed by Auguſtine. On the other hand, it is in all the other Gr. MSS. now extant. A correſponding word was in the Itc. or La. Vul. before Jerom. The ſame can be ſaid of theſe ancient verſions, the Sy. Go. Cop. Per. and the unſuſpected edition of the Ara. publiſhed by Erpenius. Chryſoſtom read as we do, and comments on the word εικη. The earlieſt Fathers, both Gr. and La. read it. This conſent of the moſt ancient eccleſiaſtic writers, the two oldeſt verſions, the Itc. and the Sy. the almoſt univerſal teſtimony of the preſent Gr. MSS. taken together, give ground to ſuſpect that the excluſion of that adverb reſts, ultimately on the authority of Jerom, who muſt have thought this limitation not of a piece with the ſtrain of the diſcourſe. I was of the ſame opinion for ſome time, and ſtrongly inclinable to reject it; but, on maturer reflection, judged this too vague a principle to warrant any alteration which common ſenſe and the ſcope of the place did not render neceſſary. Mr. Weſ. rejects this adverb, becauſe, in his opinion, it brings our Lord's inſtructions on this head, down to the Phariſaic model; for the Scribes and Phariſees, he ſays, would have condemned cauſeleſs anger as well as Jeſus Chriſt. No doubt they would. They would have alſo condemned the indulgence of libidinous thoughts and looks. [See Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraicæ, &c. on v. 28.] But the difference conſiſted in this, the generality of the Scribes at that time conſidered ſuch angry words and impure looks and thoughts as being of little or no account in themſelves, and to be avoided ſolely from motives of prudence. They might enſnare men into the perpetration of atrocious actions, the only evils which, by their doctrine, were tranſgreſſions of the law, and conſequently, could expoſe them to the judgment of God. The great error which our Lord, in this chapter, ſo ſeverely reprehends, is their diſpoſition to conſider the divine law as extending merely to the criminal and overt acts expreſsly mentioned. From theſe acts, according to them, if a man abſtained, he was, in the eye of the law, perfectly innocent, and nowiſe expoſed to divine judgment. We are not, however, to ſuppoſe that this manner of treating the law of God was univerſal among them, though doubtleſs then very prevalent. The writings of Philo in that age, and ſome of their Rabbi's ſince, ſufficiently ſhow that the Jews have always had ſome moraliſts among them, who, as well ſome Chriſtian caſuiſts could refine on the precepts of their religion, by ſtretching them even to excels.

[2] *To the council,* τω συνεδριω. It might have been rendered *to the ſanhedrim,* συνεδριον being the ordinary name given to that ſupreme judicatory. I accordingly call it ſo in thoſe places of the hiſtory, where it is evident that no other could be meant. But as the term is general, and may be uſed of any ſenate or council, though very differently conſtituted from the Jewiſh, I thought it better here not to confine it. It is not improbable alſo, that there is an alluſion in the word κρισει, *judgment,* to the ſmaller or city-councils, conſiſting of twenty-three judges.

[3] Ρακα and μωρε. Preface to this Goſpel, § 25.

[4] Γεενναν. Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 1.

26. *Farthing.* Diſſ. VII. P. I. § 10.

27. The words τοις αρχαιοις are not found in a great number of the moſt valuable MSS. and ancient verſions, particularly the Sy. The Vul. indeed has them. Mill and Wetſtein reject them.

28. *Another man's wife,* γυναικα. E. T. *A woman.* Er. *Uxorem alterius.* The word γυνη in Gr. like *femme* in Fr. ſignifies both *woman* and *wife.* The correſponding word in Heb. is liable to the ſame ambiguity. Commonly the diſtinction is made by ſome noun or pronoun, which appropriates the general name. But it is not in this way only that it is diſcovered to ſignify *wife.* Of the meaning here given and aſcertained in the ſame way by the context, we have examples, Prov. vi. 32. Eccluſ. xxvi. 7. Wet. has produced more inſtances; but in a caſe ſo evident theſe may ſuffice. If we tranſlate γυναικα woman, we ought to render εμοιχευσεν αυτην *hath debauched her.* The Gr. word admits this latitude. Thus Lucian (Dial. Dor. et Thet.) ſays of Acriſius, when his daughter Danae, whom he had devoted to perpetual virginity, proved with child, ὑπο τινος μεμοιχευσθαι οιηθεις αυτην, *ab aliquo ſtupratam fuiſſe illam arbitratus.* But I prefer the other way, as by changing here the interpretation of the word μοιχευω, the intended contraſt between our Lord's doctrine and that of the Jews is in a great meaſure loſt.

[2] *In order to cheriſh impure deſire,* προς το επιθυμησαι αυτης. E. T. *To luſt after her.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. *Ad concupiſcendum eam.* Piſc. *Ut eam concupiſcat.* The Gr. prepoſition προς before an infinitive with the article clearly marks the intention, not the effect. This all the La. verſions alſo do. The expreſſion, ch. vi. 1. προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις, here rendered *in order to be obſerved by them,* is perfectly ſimilar, and is manifeſtly employed to expreſs the intention from which the Phariſees act. Προς το means, therefore, *in order to, to the end that;* whereas ὡστε, which we have ch. viii. 24. and L. v. 7. ſignifies *ſo as to, inſomuch that,* and marks ſolely the effect. When an expreſſion, with either of theſe prepoſitions, is rendered into Eng. ſimply by the infinitive, it may be doubted whether we are to underſtand it as expreſſing the intention or the effect, and whether we ſhould ſupply before the ſign of the infinitive the words *in order,* or *ſo as.* Hence it is evident, that the common verſion of this paſſage is not ſo explicit as the original.

29. *Inſnare*

29. *Infnare thee*, σκανδαλιζει σε. E. T. *Offend thee.* Vul. *Scandalizat te.* Nothing can be farther from expreſſing the ſenſe of the Gr. term than the Eng. word *offend*, in any ſenſe wherein it is commonly uſed. Some render the expreſſion *cauſe thee to offend*. This is much better, but does not give fully the ſenſe, as it does not hint either what kind of offence is meant, or againſt whom committed. The tranſlators from the Vul. have generally, after the example of that verſion, retained the original word. Sa. ſays, *Vous ſcandalizez*; Si. no better, *Vous eſt un ſujet de ſcandale*; the Rh. *Scandelize thee.* This I conſider as no tranſlation, becauſe the words taken together convey no conceivable meaning. The common verſion is rather a miſtranſlation, becauſe the meaning it conveys is not the ſenſe of the original. The word σκανδαλον literally denotes any thing which cauſes our ſtumbling or falling, or is an obſtacle in our way. It is uſed, by metaphor, for whatever proves the occaſion of the commiſſion of ſin. The word παγις, *ſnare*, is another term which is, in Scripture, alſo uſed metaphorically, to denote the ſame thing. Nay, ſo perfectly ſynonymous are theſe words in their figurative acceptation, that, in the Sep. the Heb. word מוקש *mokeſh*, anſwering to παγις, *laqueus, a ſnare*, is often tranſlated by the Gr. word σκανδαλον than by παγις, or by any other term whatever. See Trommii Concordantiæ. Now as, in that acceptation, the verb admits a literal verſion into our language, without loſing aught of its energy, I thought it ſuited better the ſpirit of the original to adopt it, than to give the ſenſe in a periphraſis. The anonymous verſion uſes the ſame word.

37. But *let your yes be yes, your no no*, εσω δε ο λογος υμων ναι ναι, ου ου. E. T. *But let your communication be yea yea, nay nay.* I take this and the three preceding verſes to be quoted James v. 12. I ſuppoſe from memory, as conveying the ſenſe, though with ſome difference of expreſſion, μη ομνυετε μητε τον ουρανον, μητε την γην, μητε αλλον τινα ορκον· ητω δε υμων το ναι· ναι, και το ου, ου. It is but juſt that we avail ourſelves of this paſſage of the diſciple, to aſſiſt us in explaining the words of his Maſter. It was a proverbial manner among the Jews (ſee Wet.) of characteriſing a man of ſtrict probity and good faith, by ſaying, *his yes is yes, and his no is no*; that is, you may depend upon his word, as he declares, ſo it is, and as he promiſes, ſo he will do. Our Lord is, therefore, to be conſidered here, not as preſcribing the preciſe terms wherein we are to affirm or deny, in which caſe it would have ſuited better the ſimplicity of his ſtyle, to ſay barely ναι και ου, without doubling the words; but as enjoining ſuch an habitual and inflexible regard to truth, as would render ſwearing unneceſſary. That this manner of converting theſe adverbs into nouns, is in the idiom of the ſacred penmen, we have another inſtance, 2. Cor. i. 20. For all the promiſes of God in him are yea, and in him amen; εν αυτω το ναι, και εν αυτω το αμην· that is, certain and infallible truths. It is indeed a common idiom of the Gr. tongue, to turn, by means of the article, any of the parts of ſpeech into a noun. And, though there is no article in the paſſage under review, it deſerves to be remarked that Chr. in his commentaries, writes it with the article, το ναι, ναι και το ου, ου· as in the paſſage of James above quoted. Either he muſt have read thus in the copies then extant, or he muſt have thought the expreſſion elliptical, and in this way ſupplied the ellipſis. Whichſoever of theſe be true, it ſhows that he underſtood the words in the manner above explained. Indeed, they appear to have been always ſo underſtood by the Gr. Fathers. Juſtin Martyr, in the ſecond century, quotes the precept in the ſame manner, in his ſecond apology, εγω δε υμων το ναι, ναι· και το ου, ου. And to ſhew that he had the ſame meaning, he introduces it with ſignifying, that Chriſt gave this injunction to the end that we might never ſwear, but always ſpeak truth, μη ομνυειν ολως, τ' αληθη δε λεγειν αει. Now, in the way it is commonly interpreted, it has no relation to the ſpeaking of truth; whereas the above explanation gives a more emphatical import to the ſentence. Thus underſtood, it enjoins the rigid obſervance of truth as the ſure method of ſuperſeding oaths, which are never uſed in our mutual communications without betraying a conſciouſneſs of ſome latent evil, a defect in veracity as well as in piety. In like manner Clemens Alexandrinus in the beginning of the third century, Stromata, lib. v. quotes theſe words as our Lord's: Εγω υμων το ναι, ναι· και το ου, ου. The ſame alſo is done by Epiphanius in the fourth century, lib. i. contra Offenos. Philo's ſentiment on this ſubject (in his book Περι των δικα λογιων) is both excellent in itſelf, and here very appoſite. It is to this effect, that we ought never to ſwear, but to be ſo uniformly obſervant of truth in our converſation, that our word may always be regarded as an oath. Καλλιστον, και βιωφελεστατον, και αρμοττον λογικη φυσει, το ανωμοτον, ουτως αληθευειν ωφ' ἑκασε δεδιδαγμενη, ως τας λογους ὁρκους ειναι νομιζεσθαι.

37. *Proceedeth from evil*, εκ του πονηρου εστιν. Some render it *cometh from the evil one*, ſuppoſing του πονηρου to be the genitive of ὁ πονηρος, *the evil one*, that is, *the devil.* But it is at leaſt as probably the genitive of το πονηρον, *evil*, in the abſtract, or whatever this epithet may be juſtly applied to. The ſame doubt has been raiſed in regard to that petition in the Lord's prayer, *Deliver us from evil*, απο του πονηρου, or *from the evil one.* I conſider it as a maxim in tranſlating, that when a word is, in all reſpects, equally ſuſceptible of two interpretations, one of which, as a genus, comprehends the other, always to prefer the more extenſive. The *evil one* is comprehended under the general term *evil.* But in the phraſe the *evil one*, the pravity of a man's own heart, or any kind of evil, Satan alone excepted, is not included. If we fail in the former way, the author's ſenſe is ſtill given, though leſs definitely. If we err in the other way, the author's ſenſe is not given, but a different ſenſe of our own.

39. *Reſiſt not the injurious*, μη αντιστηναι τω πονηρω. E. T. *Reſiſt not evil.* It is plain here from what follows that τω πονηρω is the dative of ὁ πονηρος, not of το πονηρον. It is equally plain that by ὁ πονηρος is not meant here *the devil*; for to that malignant ſpirit we do not find imputed in Scripture ſuch injuries as ſmiting a man on the cheek

cheek, taking away his coat, or compelling him to attend him on a journey.

40. *Coat*, χιτωνα—*mantle*, ἱματιον. Diff. VIII. P. III. § 1, 2.

42. *Him that would borrow from thee put not away*, τον θελοντα απο συ δανεισασθαι μη αποστραφης. E. T. *From him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.* Of theſe two verſions the former is the cloſer, but there is little or no difference in meaning. Either way rendered, the import is, *Do not reject his ſuit.*

44. *Bleſs them who curſe you.* This clauſe is wanting in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. verſions, and in three MSS. of ſmall account.

2. *Arraign*, επηρεαζοντων. E. T. *Deſpitefully uſe.* Vul. *Calumniantibus.* This ſuits better the ſenſe of the word 1 Pet. iii. 16. the only other place in Scripture (the parallel paſſage in L. excepted) where it occurs, οι επηρεαζοντες υμων την αγαθην εν Χριστω αναστροφην, which our tranſlators render *who falſely accuſe your good converſation in Chriſt.* Elſner juſtly obſerves, that the word has frequently a forenſic ſignification for bringing a criminal charge againſt one. Its being followed by the verb διωκω makes it probable that it is uſed in that ſenſe here. I have tranſlated it *arraign*, becauſe it ſuits the meaning of the word in the above quotation, and is equally adapted to the original in the juridical and in the common acceptation.

45. *That ye may be children of your Father in heaven*; that is, that ye may ſhow yourſelves by a conformity of diſpoſition to be his children.

2. *Maketh his ſun ariſe on bad and good, and ſendeth rain on juſt and unjuſt*, τον ηλιον αυτου ανατελλει επι πονηρους και αγαθους, και βρεχει επι δικαιους και αδικους. E. T. *Maketh his ſun to riſe on the evil and on the good, and ſendeth rain on the juſt and on the unjuſt.* An indiſcriminate diſtribution of favours to men of the moſt oppoſite characters is much better expreſſed, in the original, without the diſcriminative article, and without even repeating the prepoſition unneceſſarily, than it is in our common verſion, where the diſtinction is marked by both with ſo much formality. Another example of this ſort we have ch. xxii. 10. I am ſurpriſed that Sc, who, in general, more in the taſte of the ſynagogue than of the church, is ſuperſtitiouſly literal, has, both here and elſewhere, paid ſo little regard to what concerns the article.

47. *Your friends.* E. T. *Your brethren.* The reading of moſt MSS. and ſome of the oldeſt is, τους φιλους υμων. Of ancient verſions alſo, the ſecond Sy. and the Go. have read thus. It is the reading of the edition of Alcala, and is favoured by Wet. and other critics. The ſenſe however, it muſt be owned, is little affected by the difference.

2. *Wherein do ye excel? τι περισσον ποιειτε.* E. T. *What do ye more than others?* Our Lord had declared, v. 20. *Unleſs your righteouſneſs excel*, εαν μη περισσευση, *the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall never enter the kingdom of heaven.* Now to that declaration there appears in the queſtion τι περισσον ποιειτε a manifeſt reference, which in the common verſion diſappears entirely. I have endeavoured to preſerve it, by imitating the original, in recurring to the term formerly uſed. Our Lord's expoſtulation is rendered more energetical by the contraſt. 'If ye do good to your friends only, 'your righteouſneſs, which, I told you, muſt excel that of the Scribes and Phariſees, will not excel even that of the Publicans and Pagans.

3. *The Pagans.* The reading is οι εθνικοι in the Cam. and ſeveral other MSS. It is ſupported by a number of ancient verſions, the Vul. Cop. ſecond Sy. Eth. Ara. Sax. It was ſo read by Chr. and ſeveral of the Fathers. It is, beſides, much in our Lord's manner, not to recur to the ſame perſons, but to others in ſimilar circumſtances. Publicans, when exhibited, in the Goſpel, as of an opprobrious character, are commonly claſſed with ſinners, with harlots, or, as in this place, with heathens. The Go. has both words, but in a different order, Pagans in the 46th verſe, and Publicans in the 47th.

CHAP. VI.

1. *That ye perform not your religious duties*, την ελεημοσυνην υμων μη ποιειν. E. T. *That ye do not your alms.* Some MSS. have δικαιοσυνην inſtead of ελεημοσυνην. The Vul. has *juſtitiam veſtram.* The Sy. and Sax. are to the ſame purpoſe. Some of the Fathers read ſo. I do not take δικαιοσυνη (which is probably the genuine reading) to be uſed here for ελεημοσυνη, and to mean *alms*, as mentioned in the next verſe; but I conceive with Dod. this verſe to be a common introduction to the three ſucceeding paragraphs, in relation to alms, prayer, and faſting. This removes Wh.'s and Wet.'s principal objection to this reading, namely, that it is not likely the evangeliſt would, in the following words, when naming alms, have thrice called them ελεημοσυνη, after introducing the mention of them by another name. As to Wet.'s objection to the hypotheſis here adopted, that he does not find prayer and faſting ever called δικαιοσυνη, it is well anſwered by Biſhop Pearce, in his Commentary, that in our Lord's parable of the Phariſee and the Publican, propounded on purpoſe to rebuke the conceit which the Phariſees had of their own righteouſneſs, mention is made of faſting and paying tithes, as coming under this denomination. Further, in ch. iii. 15. John's baptiſm, an ordinance in itſelf of a poſitive, not moral, nature, was comprehended under the ſame term. However, as the authorities for this departure from the common reading are not ſo numerous as thoſe by which, on moſt other occaſions, I have been determined, it is proper to give the reaſons which have inclined me to adopt this correction. It appears to be quite in our Lord's manner to introduce inſtructions regarding particular duties by ſome general ſentiment or admonition, which is illuſtrated or exemplified in them all. In the preceding chapter, after the general warning, v. 20. *Unleſs your righteouſneſs excel*, &c. there follows

an illuſtration of the ſentiment, in regard, 1ſt, to murder, next to adultery and divorce, 3dly, to ſwearing, and, 4thly, to retaliation and the love of our neighbour; the ſcope of every one of theſe being to enforce the doctrine with which he had preſaced thoſe leſſons. As, in the former chapter, he ſhowed the extent of the divine law; in this, he ſhows that the virtue of the beſt performances may be annihilated by a vicious motive, ſuch as vain glory. His general admonition on this head is illuſtrated in theſe particulars, alms, prayer, and faſting. Add to this, that if we retain the common reading, there is in v. 2. a tautology which is not in our Lord's manner. But if the firſt verſe be underſtood as a general precept againſt oſtentation in religion, the abſtaining from the common methods of gratifying this humour, in the performance of a particular duty, is very ſuitably ſubjoined as a conſequence.

2. *They have received their reward,* απεχουσι τον μισθον αυτων; that is, they have received that applauſe which they ſeek, and work for. Knatchbul and others think that the word απο ω here means *hinder* or *prevent.* On this ſuppoſition the words may be rendered, *They preclude their reward,* to wit, the reward of virtue in heaven. But I do not find that in any other paſſage of the N. T. where the word occurs, this ſenſe can properly be admitted. Wherever, in the Septuagint, the verb is uſed actively, the meaning is not to hinder, but to obtain. Were, therefore, the only claſſical authority that has been produced on the other ſide, as clear as it is doubtful, the ordinary verſion of the word, which is alſo that of the Vul. and Sy. and other ancient tranſlations, is here, by the rules of interpretation, entitled to the preference.

4. *Recompenſe thee.* In the common Gr. copies, after αποδωσει σοι, we read εν τω φανερω; which our tranſlators render *openly.* But theſe words are not found in ſome ancient and valuable MSS. were not received by ſeveral of the moſt eminent Fathers, nor have been admitted into the Vul. the Sax. or the Cop. verſions. Wet. thinks that both Jerom and Auguſtine have been led to reject this expreſſion, by an exceſſive deference to the opinion of Origen, who did not think it probable that our Lord, in diſſuading his diſciple from paying a regard to the judgment of men, would have introduced, as an incitement, that the reward ſhould be in public, a circumſtance which brought them back, as it were by another road, to have ſtill a regard to the eſteem of men. But from the words which Wet. quotes from Auguſtine, that appears not to have been this Father's reaſon for rejecting thoſe words. His declared reaſon was, becauſe the expreſſion was not found in the Gr. MSS. That by Gr. MSS. he meant Jerom's La. verſion, is preſumed by Wet. without evidence, and againſt probability. The ſame appears to have been Origen's reaſon for rejecting the words; though he juſtly conſidered their containing ſomething repugnant to the ſcope of the argument, as adding credibility to his verdict. And even this additional reaſon of Origen's is, by the way, more feebly anſwered by Wet. than might have been expected: *Debebat,* ſays he, ſpeaking of Origen, *diſtinguere gloriam quæ a Deo eſt, et gloriam quæ eſt ab hominibus. Illi ſtudendum eſt, non huic.* But did not Wet. advert, that in the promiſe, *God ſhall reward thee openly,* both are contained, honour from God the rewarder, and honour from men the ſpectators, the moſt incredulous of whom muſt be convinced, by ſo glorious an award of the infallible judge? Now, if the firſt ought alone to be regarded, of what ſignificance is it whether the reward, which God gives, ſhall be public or private? Er. and Ben. therefore, acted, not without reaſon, in rejecting theſe words. It appears to me moſt probable, that ſome tranſcriber, thinking it certain that the recompenſe here meant is that which will be given at the general judgment, and perceiving that εν τω φανερω made a good antitheſis to εν τω κρυπτω, in the preceding clauſe, has added it by way of gloſs on the margin, whence it has been brought into the text. This is probably the origin of ſome other interpolations. This remark ſhould be extended to verſes 6th and 18th. In regard to the laſt mentioned, the number of MSS. as well as of ancient verſions which omit the εν τω φανερω, are ſo many that Wet. himſelf has thought fit to reject it.

7. *Talk not idly,* μη βαττολογησητε. E. T. *Uſe not vain repetitions.* This interpretation is rather too confined. *Vain repetitions* are doubtleſs included in the prohibition. But they are not all that is here prohibited. Every thing in words that may juſtly be called *vain, idle,* or *fooliſh,* may be conſidered as comprehended under the term βαττολογειν. The word πολυλογια, applied to the ſame fault in the latter part of the verſe, is a further evidence of this.

10. *Thy reign come.* Diſſ. V. P. I.

11. *Our daily bread,* τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον. Vulg. *Panem noſtrum ſuperſubſtantialem.* Rhe. *Our ſuperſubſtantial bread.* The ſame word, επιουσιον, is, however, in the parallel place in L. rendered in the Vulg. *quotidianum.* In this way it had been tranſlated in both places in the Itc. with which agrees the Sax. verſion: η επιουσα, *viz.* ημερα, means literally the *coming day,* a phraſe which, in the morning, may have been uſed for the day already commenced, and in the evening, for *to-morrow.* There is probably an alluſion here to the proviſion of manna made for the Iſraelites in the deſert, which was from day to day. Every day's portion was gathered in the morning, except the ſeventh day's. But in order to prevent the breach of the Sabbath, they received a double portion on the ſixth day. That food, therefore, may literally be termed ο αρτος αυτων ο επιουσιος. This ſuits, in ſenſe, the Sy. ܕܡܗܪ *demahar,* the word, according to Jerom, uſed in the Nazarean Goſpel, which is accounted, by critics of great name, a genuine though not faultleſs copy of Mt.'s original. See the Preface, § 13.

12. *Our*

12. *Our debts*, τα οφειλημματα ημων. That *ſins* are meant, or *offences againſt God*, there can be no doubt. At firſt, therefore, for perſpicuity's ſake, I rendered the verſe thus: *Forgive us our offences, as we forgive them who offend us.* But reflecting that the metaphor is plain in itſelf, and rendered familiar by ſcriptural uſe; reflecting alſo, that the remiſſion of real *debts*, in many caſes, as well as *injuries*, is a duty clearly deducible from our Lord's inſtructions, and may be intentionally included in the clauſe ſubjoined to the petition, I thought it better to retain the general terms of the common verſion.

13. *Abandon us not to temptation*, μη εισενεγκης ημας εις πειρασμον. E. T. *Lead us not into temptation.* The verb εισφερειν, in the Sept. is almoſt always uſed to expreſs the Heb verb בוא *to go*, in the conjugation *hiphil*, which, agreeably to the uſual power of that conjugation, denotes, to cauſe to go, to bring, to lead. But though this be the uſual, it is not the conſtant, import of that form of the verb. The *hiphil*, ſometimes, inſtead of implying to cauſe to do, denotes no more than to permit, not to hinder. Nor need we be ſurpriſed at this, when we conſider that, in all known languages, petitions and commands, things the moſt contrary in nature, are expreſſed by the ſame mood, the imperative. The words, *give me*, may either mark a requeſt from my Maker, or an order to my ſervant. Yet ſo much, in moſt caſes, do the attendant circumſtances fix the ſenſe, that little inconvenience ariſes from this latitude. In the N. T. there appear ſeveral examples of this extent of meaning in verbs, in analogy to the power of that conjugation. Mr. v. 12. *The devils beſought him, ſaying, Send us*, πεμψον ημας, *into the ſwine.* Here the words, *ſend us*, mean no more than the words, *ſuffer us to go* επιτρεψον ημιν απελθειν, do in Mt. In this ſenſe the word is uſed alſo in other places, as when God is ſaid, 2 Theſſ. ii. 11. *to ſend ſtrong delu ſions. Send away*, Gen. xxiv. 54. 56. 59. means no more than *let go.*

2. *Preſerve us from evil*, ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου. E. T. *Deliver us from evil.* The import of the word *deliver*, in ſuch an application as this, is no more than to reſcue from an evil into which one has already fallen; but the verb ρυομαι, which is frequently uſed by the Seventy for a Heb. word ſignifying *to ſave*, or *preſerve*, denotes here as evidently, keep us from falling into evil, as deliver us from the evils into which we are fallen

3. Οτι σου εστιν η βασιλεια, και η δυναμις, και η δοξα εις τους αιωνας. Αμην. E. T. *For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory for ever. Amen.* This doxology is wanting, not only in ſeveral ancient Gr. MSS. but in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Ara. verſions. It was not in the Gr. copies uſed by Origen, Gregory Nyſſen, or Cyril. Ceſarius quotes it, not as from the Scripture, but as from the liturgy uſed in the Gr. churches; whence, in all human probability, according to the judgment of the moſt celebrated critics, it has firſt been taken. I ſhall only add Wet.'s remark: "Si hæc δοξολογια non pars eſt, "ſed appendix vel antiphona orationis dominicæ, cui "in eccleſia a ſacerdote ſolo, et ſemper addi ſolebat, "omnia plana ſunt, et facile intelligimus, cur librarii "illam Mattheo adjecerint; ſin autem ab ipſo Domino "ſuit præſcripta, qui factum, ut ipſo verba præeunte, "nec omnes diſcipuli, nec Lucas Evangeliſta, nec "Patres Græci, nec tota eccleſia Latina ſequerentur? "Porro ſi quis rem ipſam propius conſideraverit, deprehendet, utique δεξολογιαν loco minus commodo hic "inſeri: apparet enim tum comma 14. hoc modo "nimis longe removeri a præcedente commate 12. "cujus tamen explicandi gratia, adjectum eſt, &c."

18. *To thy Father; and thy Father to whom, though he is unſeen himſelf, nothing is ſecret*, τω πατρι σου, τω εν τω κρυπτω. και ο πατηρ σου ο βλεπων εν τω κρυπτω. E. T. *Unto thy Father which is in ſecret; and thy Father which ſeeth in ſecret.* It muſt be acknowledged that the expreſſion, *which is in ſecret*, is rather dark and indefinite. If underſtood as denoting that every the moſt ſecret thing is known to God, the latter clauſe, *which ſeeth in ſecret*, is a mere tautology: but this cannot be admitted to have been the intention of the ſacred writer; for the manner in which the clauſe is introduced, ſhows evidently, that ſomething further was intended by it than to repeat in other words what has been ſaid immediately before. On v. 6. there is indeed a different reading, two MSS. want the article τω after πατρι σου, which makes the ſecreſy refer to the act of praying, not to the Father prayed to. In ſupport of this reading, the Vul. and Ara. verſions are alſo pleaded. But this authority is far too inconſiderable to warrant a change, not abſolutely neceſſary, in point of meaning, or of conſtruction. Beſides, there is no variation of reading on this 18th verſe, either in verſions or in MSS. Now the two paſſages are ſo perfectly parallel in their aim, and ſimilar in their ſtructure, that there is no ground to ſuppoſe a change in the one, which does not take place in the other. The unanimity, therefore, of the witneſſes, that is, of the MSS. editions, and verſions, which ſupport the reading of v. 18th, is a ſtrong confirmation of the common reading of v. 6th. But what then is to be underſtood by ο εν τω κρυπτω? I anſwer, with Gro. Wh. and others, that ο εν τω κρυπτω is here a periphraſis for ο κρυπτομενος, and ſignifies *hidden, unperceived, unſeen.* The ſentiment reſembles that of the poet Philemon,

Ο παντ' ειδων τε κ' αυτος κχ' ειρομενος;

who ſees all things, and is unſeen himſelf. To this purpoſe the words are rendered by Caſ. *Patri tuo qui occultus eſt, et pater tuus qui occulta cernit.* Si. has underſtood this to be the meaning of the Vul. which ſays, *Qui eſt in abſcondito*, as he tranſlates it in this manner, *Votre pere qui ne paroit point; et vôtre pere qui voit ce qu'il y a de plus caché.*

19. *Treaſure*, θησαυρος. I have here retained the word *treaſure*, though not perfectly correſponding to the Gr. θησαυρος. With us, nothing is *treaſure* but the precious metals. Here it denotes *ſtores* of all kinds. That *garments* were ſpecially intended, the mention of *moths* plainly ſhows. It was cuſtomary for the opulent in Aſiatic countries, where their faſhions in dreſs were not fluctuating like ours, to have repoſitories full of rich and ſplendid apparel. However, as the ſenſe here could not be miſtaken, I thought energy of expreſſion was to be preferred to ſtrict propriety. For the ſame reaſon I have retained the common verſion of

βρωσις *ruſt* (though the word be unuſual in this meaning), becauſe it may denote any thing which corrodes, conſumes, or ſpoils goods of any kind. Dod. ſays *canker*.

22. *Sound*, ἁπλους. E. T. *ſingle*. Both Chr. and The. repreſent the Gr. word as ſynonymous here with ὑγιης, *ſanus*.

23. *Diſtempered*, πονηρος. E. T. *evil*. The. νοσωδης, *morbidus*. That there is no reference to the primitive meaning of ἁπλους, *ſimple*, or *ſingle*, is evident from its being contraſted to πονηρος, and not to διπλους.

How great will the darkneſs be? πο σκοτος ποσον. E. T. *How great is that darkneſs?* The words are rendered in the ſame way in all the Eng. verſions I have ſeen, except thoſe made from the Vul. which ſays, Ipſæ tenebræ *quantæ erunt?* From this the other La. tranſlations do not materially differ; nor the Itn. of Dio. *Quante ſaranno le tenebre?* nor the Fr. of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. or L. Cl. who concur in rendering it, *Combien ſeront grandes les tenebres mêmes?* nor the Ger. of Lu who ſays, wie groſs wird denn die finſterniſs ſelber ſeyn? The only foreign verſions I have ſeen, which tranſlate this paſſage in the ſame manner with the Eng. are the old G. F. *Combien grandes ſeront ces tenebres la?* and the Itn. and Fr. verſions of Giovian Luigi Paſchale. In the former of them it is, *Eſſe tenebre quanto ſaranno grandi?* in the latter, *Combien grandes ſeront icelles tenebres?* Let it be obſerved, that there is nothing in the original anſwering to the pronoun *that* which in this place mars the ſenſe inſtead of illuſtrating it. The concluding word *darkneſs*, it makes refer to *the eye*, whereas it certainly refers to *the body*, or all the other members as contradiſtinguiſhed to the eye. Thoſe who explain it of *the eye*, repreſent our Saviour as ſaying, *If thine eye be dark, how dark is thine eye?* the meaning of which I have no conception of. In my apprehenſion, our Lord's argument ſtands thus: 'The eye is the 'lamp of the body; from it all the other members de-'rive their light. Now if that which is the light of the 'body be darkened, how miſerable will be the ſtate of 'the body? how great will be the darkneſs of thoſe mem-'bers which have no light of their own, but depend 'entirely on the eye?' And to ſhow that this applies equally in the figurative or moral, as in the literal ſenſe: 'If the conſcience, that mental light which God 'has given to man for regulating his moral conduct, 'be itſelf vitiated; what will be the ſtate of the appe-'tites and paſſions, which are naturally blind and pre-'cipitate?' Or, to take the thing in another view: 'You, my diſciples, I have called the light of the 'world, becauſe deſtined for inſtructors and guides to the 'reſt of mankind; but if ye ſhould come, through igno-'rance and abſurd prejudices, to miſtake evil for good, 'and good for evil, how dark and wretched will be the 'condition of thoſe who depend on the inſtructions they 'receive from you, for their guidance and direction?'

24. *Mammon*, that is, *riches*. Mammon is a Sy. word, which the Evangeliſts have retained, as ſerving better to convey the energy of our Lord's expreſſion. Wealth is here perſonified, and repreſented as a maſter who rivals God in our hearts. The word is become familiar enough to our ears to anſwer the ſame purpoſe.

25. *Be not anxious*, μη μεριμνατε. E. T. *Take no thought*. I do not think there is, in the common verſion, a more palpable deviation than this from the ſenſe of the original. Paul ſays, Eph. v. 18. μη μεθυσκεσθε οινω, *Be not drunk with wine*. Should one tranſlate this precept, *Drink no wine*, the departure from the ſenſe of the author would, in my opinion, be neither greater nor more evident. Μεθη does not more clearly ſignify exceſs than μεριμνα does; the former in indulging a ſenſual gratification, the other in cheriſhing an inordinate concern about the things of this life. Paul has ſuggeſted the boundaries, in his admonition, to the Philippians, iv. 6. *Be careful for nothing*, μηδεν μεριμνατε, *but in every thing by prayer and ſupplication, with thankſgiving, let your requeſts be made known unto God*. Even here the phraſe would have been better rendered, *Be anxious about nothing;* for doubtleſs we ought not to be careleſs about whatever is worthy to be the ſubject of a requeſt to God. To *take no thought* about what concerns our own ſupport, and the ſupport of thoſe who depend upon us, would inevitably prove the ſource of that improvidence and inaction, which are in the N. T. branded as criminal in a very high degree. See 1 Tim. v. 8. 2 Theſſ. iii. 8. There is not an apparent only, but a real, contradiction in the Apoſtle's ſentiments to our Lord's precepts, as they appear in the common verſion, but not the ſhadow of a repugnancy to them, as expreſſed, by the Evangeliſt. To be without anxiety, is moſt commonly the attendant of induſtry in our vocation, joined with an habitual truſt in Providence, and acquieſcence in its diſpenſations. The Vul. renders the words very properly, *Ne ſoliciti ſitis*, and in this is followed by Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Piſc. and Caſ. Ar. has adopted the barbarous word *anxiemini*, in preference to the claſſical *cogitetis* (as the latter does not reach the ſenſe), that he might expreſs in one word in his verſion what is expreſſed in one word in Gr. It is true, that in v. 27. the Vul. renders the word μεριμνων, *cogitans*. But one who conſiders the taſte in which the greater part of that verſion is compoſed, can be at no loſs to aſſign the reaſon of his changing the word. The tranſlator, though not ſo extravagantly attached to the letter, as Arias and Pagnin, yet was attached to it even to exceſs; and having no participle from the ſame root with *ſolicitus*, to anſwer μεριμνων, choſe rather to change the word for a weaker, and ſays *cogitans*, than either to alter the participial form of the expreſſion, or to adopt a barbarous term. The latter of theſe methods was afterwards taken by Ar. who ſaid *anxiatus;* the former, which was the better method, by the reſt. Er. Zu. Piſc. and Be. ſay, *ſolicitè cogitando*. Cal.

Cal. *anxiè curando.* Caſ. *ſua ſolicitudine.* No foreign verſion that I know, ancient or modern, agrees with the Eng. in. this particular. As to latter Eng. tranſlations, ſuffice it to obſerve, that, Weſ.'s alone excepted, there is none of thoſe I have ſeen, that does not uſe either *anxious* or *ſolicitous.* I have preferred the former, both as coming nearer the ſenſe of the original, and as being in more familiar uſe. It may not be improper to obſerve, that Wy. has employed the term *over-ſolicitous*, which I think faulty in the other extreme. Solicitude, as I underſtand it, implies exceſs, and conſequently ſome degree of diſtruſt in Providence, and want of reſignation. To ſay, *Be not over ſolicitous*, is in effect to ſay, Ye may be ſolicitous, if ye do not carry your ſolicitude too far; a ſpeech unbefitting both the ſpeaker and the occaſion. Dio. a very good tranſlator, is perhaps reprehenſible for the ſame error. *Non ſiate con anſieta ſollecite.* We have, however, a moſt harmonious ſuffrage of tranſlators, ancient and modern, againſt our common verſion in this inſtance. Some would ſay, that even Weſ. might be included, who does not ſay, *Take no thought*, but, *Take not thought;* for there is ſome difference between theſe expreſſions.

2. *What ye ſhall eat, or what ye ſhall drink,* τι φαγητε και τι πιητε. The words, και τι πιητε, are wanting in two MSS. Likewiſe the Vul. Sax. and Eth. verſions, have not this clauſe. But theſe are of no weight, compared with the evidence on the other ſide. It adds to this conſiderably, that when our Lord, in the concluſion of his argument, v. 31ſt, expreſſes, for the laſt time, the precept he had been enforcing, both clauſes are found in all the MSS. and verſions.

3. *Or,* και. This is one example in which the conjunction και is, with equal propriety, tranſlated into Eng. *or.* When the ſentence contains a prohibition of two different things, it often happens that either way will expreſs the ſenſe. When the copulative *and*, is uſed, the verb is underſtood as repeated. Thus: be not anxious what ye ſhall eat; and be not anxious what ye ſhall drink. When the disjunctive, *or*, is uſed, it expreſſes with us rather more ſtrongly, that the whole force of the prohibition equally affects each of the things mentioned; as, *Be not anxious either what ye ſhall eat or what ye ſhall drink.* In the conjunction, *and*, in ſuch caſes, there is ſometimes a ſlight ambiguity. Both the things mentioned may be prohibited, taken jointly, when it is not meant to prohibit them ſeverally. Another inſtance of this kind, not perfectly ſimilar, the critical reader will obſerve, ch. vii. 6.

I ſhall here obſerve, by the way, that there are two extremes, to one or other of which moſt interpreters lean, in tranſlating the inſtructions given by our Lord. Some endeavour to ſoften what to their taſte is harſh; and ſeem afraid of ſpeaking out to the world, what the ſacred hiſtorian has authoriſed them to ſay. Others, on the contrary, imagining that moral precepts cannot be too rigorous, give generally the ſevereſt and moſt unnatural interpretation to every word that can admit more than one, and ſometimes even affix a meaning (whereof μεριμνα is an inſtance) for which they have no authority, ſacred or profane. There is a danger on each ſide, againſt which a faithful interpreter ought to be equally guarded. Our Lord's precepts are in the Oriental manner, conciſely and proverbially expreſſed; and we acknowledge, that all of them are not to be expounded by the moraliſt, ſtrictly according to the letter. But whatever allowance may be made to the expoſitor or commentator, this is what the tranſlator has no title to expect. The character juſt now given of our Lord's precepts, is their character in the original, as they were written by the inſpired penmen for their contemporaries; it is the tranſlator's buſineſs to give them to his readers, as much as poſſible, ſtamped with the ſame ſignature with which they were given by the Evangeliſts to theirs. Thoſe methods, therefore, of enervating the expreſſion, to render the doctrine more palatable to us moderns, and better ſuited to the reigning ſentiments and manners, are not to be approved. I have given an inſtance of this fault in Wy. and Dio. I ſhall add another from the pious Dod. v. 39. Εγω δε λεγω υμιν, μη αντιστηναι τω πονηρω, he renders thus: *But I ſay unto you, that you do not ſet yourſelves againſt the injurious perſon.* In this he is followed by Wor. and Wa. The phraſe, *do not ſet yourſelf againſt a man*, if it mean any thing, means, *do not become his enemy*, or do not act the part of an enemy; a ſenſe neither ſuited to the words, nor to the context. To pretend to ſupport it from etymology, is no better than it would be to contend that *intelligo* ſhould be tranſlated, *I read between*, and *manumitto*, *I ſend with the hand;* or, (to recur to our own language, which anſwers equally well) to explain *I underſtand*, as denoting *I ſtand under*, or *I reflect*, as implying *I bend back.* The attempt was the more futile here, as every one of the three following examples, whereby our Lord illuſtrated his precept, ſufficiently ſhows that the meaning of αντιστηναι (had the word been equivocal, as it is not) could be nothing elſe than as it is commonly rendered, *reſiſt*, or *oppoſe.* The anonymous tranſlator 1729, ſeems likewiſe to have diſreliſhed this precept, rendering it, *Don't return evil for evil*; a Chriſtian precept doubtleſs, but not the precept of the text. Our Lord ſays expreſsly, and the whole context vouches his meaning, *Do not reſiſt*; his tranſlator will have him to ſay, *Do not reſent.* Jeſus manifeſtly warns us againſt oppoſing an injury offered; his interpreter will have him only to diſſuade us from revenging an injury committed. Yet in the very interpretation which he gives of the following words, he has afforded an irrefragable evidence againſt himſelf, that it is of the former that Chriſt is ſpeaking, and not of the latter.

But it muſt be owned, that there is danger alſo on the other ſide, to which our tranſlators have, in rendering ſome paſſages, evidently leaned. It is in vain to think to draw reſpect to a law by ſtraining it ever ſo little beyond what conſiſtency and right reaſon will warrant. "Expect no good," ſays the Biſhop of Meaux, "from thoſe who overſtrain virtue." *Ne croyez jamais rien de bon de ceux qui outrent la vertu*, Hiſt. des Variations, &c. liv. ii. ch. 60. Nothing can be

better founded than this maxim, though it may juſtly ſurpriſe us to read it in that author, as nothing can be more ſubverſive of the whole fabric of monachiſm. There is not, however, a more effectual method, than by ſuch immoderate ſtretches, of affording a ſhelter and apology for tranſgreſſion. And when once the plea of impracticability is (though not avowedly, tacitly) admitted in ſome caſes, it never fails to be gradually extended to other caſes, and comes at laſt to undermine the authority of the whole. That this, to the great ſcandal of the Chriſtian name, is become too much the way, in regard to our Lord's precepts, in all ſects and denominations of Chriſtians, is a truth too evident to admit a queſtion.

27. *Prolong his life one hour.* L. xii. 25. N.

28. *Mark the lilies of the field. How do they grow?* Καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου πως αυξανει· So it is commonly pointed in the printed editions. But in the old MSS. there is no pointing. Nor are the points to be conſidered as reſting on any other than human authority, like the diviſion into chapters and verſes. I agree, therefore, with Palairet, who thinks that there ſhould be a full ſtop after αγρου, and that the remaining words ſhould be marked as an interrogation, thus, καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου. Πως αυξανει; This perfectly ſuits both the ſcope of the place, and the vivacity of our Lord's manner, through the whole diſcourſe.

30. *The herbage,* του χορτου. E. T. *The graſs.* But lilies are not graſs; neither is graſs fit for heating an oven. That the lily is here included under the term χορτος, is (if there were no other) ſufficient evidence, that more is meant by it than is ſignified with us by the term *graſs.* I acknowledge, however, that the claſſical ſenſe of the Gr. word is *graſs*, or *hay.* It is a juſt remark of Gro. that the Hebrews ranked the whole vegetable ſyſtem under two claſſes, עץ *ghets*, and עשב *ghesheb.* The firſt is rendered ξυλον, or δενδρον, *tree;* to expreſs the ſecond, the Seventy have adopted χορτος, as their common way was to tranſlate one Heb. word by one Gr. word, though not quite proper, rather than by a circumlocution. It is accordingly uſed in their verſion, Gen. i. 11. where the diſtinction firſt occurs, and in moſt other places. Nor is it with greater propriety rendered *graſs*, in Eng. than χορτος in Greek. The ſame diviſion occurs Rev. viii. 7. where our tranſlators have in like manner had recourſe to the term *graſs.* I have adopted, as coming nearer the meaning of the ſacred writer, the word *herbage*, which Johnſon defines herbs collectively. Under the name *herb* is comprehended every ſort of plant which has not, like trees and ſhrubs, a perennial ſtalk. That many, if not all ſorts of ſhrubs, were included, by the Hebrews, under the denomination *tree*, is evident from Jotham's apologue of the trees chooſing a king, Jud. ix. 7. where the *bramble* is mentioned as one.

30. *Into the oven,* εις τον κλιβανον. Wef. *into the ſtill.* But on what authority, ſacred or profane, κλιβανος is made *a ſtill*, he does not acquaint us. For my part, I have not found a veſtige of evidence in any ancient author, that the art of diſtillation was then known. The only objection of moment, againſt the common verſion of κλιβανος, is removed by the former part of this note. Indeed, the ſcarcity of fewel in thoſe parts, both formerly and at preſent, fully accounts for their having recourſe to withered herbs for heating their ovens. It accounts, alſo, for the frequent recourſe of the ſacred penmen to thoſe ſimilitudes, whereby things, found unfit for any nobler purpoſe, are repreſented as reſerved for the fire. See Harmer's Obſervations, ch. iv. obſ. vi. As to the words *to day* and *to morrow*, every body knows that this is a proverbial idiom, to denote that the tranſition is ſudden.

30. *O ye diſtruſtful!* ολιγοπιστοι. E. T. *O ye of little faith!* It is quite in the genius of the Gr. language, to expreſs, by ſuch compound words, what in other languages is expreſſed by a more ſimple term. Nor do our tranſlators, or indeed any tranſlators, always judge it neceſſary to trace, in a periphraſis, the ſeveral parts of the compoſition. In a few caſes, wherein a ſingle word entirely adequate cannot be found, this method is proper, but not otherwiſe. I have ſeen no verſion which renders ολιγοψυχοι, *they of little ſoul*, or μακροθυμια, *length of mind*, or φιλονεικος, *a lover of quarrels.* How many are the words of this kind in the N. T. whoſe component parts no tranſlator attemps to exhibit in his verſion? Such are, πλεονεξια, μεγαλοπρεπης, κληρονομεω, ειλικρινης, and many others. The word *diſtruſtful* comes nearer the ſenſe than the phraſe *of little faith;* becauſe this may expreſs any kind of incredulity or ſcepticiſm; whereas anxiety about the things of life ſtands in direct oppoſition to an unſhaken truſt in the providence and promiſes of God.

33. *Seek—the righteouſneſs required by him,* ζητειτε—την δικαιοσυνην αυτου. E. T. *Seek—his righteouſneſs. The righteouſneſs of God*, in our idiom, can mean only the juſtice or moral rectitude of the divine nature, which it were abſurd in us to ſeek, it being, as all God's attributes are, inſeparable from his eſſence. But in the Heb. idiom, that righteouſneſs, which conſiſts in a conformity to the declared will of God, is called *his righteouſneſs.* In this way the phraſe is uſed by Paul, Rom. iii. 21, 22. x. 3. where *the righteouſneſs of God* is oppoſed by the Apoſtle to that of the unconverted Jews; and *their own righteouſneſs*, which he tells us they went about to eſtabliſh, does not appear to ſignify their perſonal righteouſneſs, any more than the righteouſneſs of God ſignifies his perſonal righteouſneſs. The word *righteouſneſs*, as I conceive, denotes there what we ſhould call a ſyſtem of morality, or righteouſneſs, which he denominates their own, becauſe fabricated by themſelves, founded partly on the letter of law, partly on tradition, and conſiſting moſtly in ceremonies, and mere externals. This creature of their own imaginations they had cheriſhed, to the neglect of that purer ſcheme of morality which was truly of God, which they might have learnt even formerly from the law and the Prophets,

phets, properly underſtood, but now more explicitly from the doctrine of Chriſt. That the phraſe, *the righteouſneſs of God*, in the ſenſe I have given, was not unknown to the O. T. writers, appears from Micah vi. What is called, v. 5. *the righteouſneſs of the Lord*, which God wanted that the people ſhould know, is explained, v. 8. to be *what the Lord requireth* of them, namely, *to do juſtly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God*. It is in this ſenſe we ought to underſtand the phraſe, James i. 20. *The wrath of man worketh not the righteouſneſs of God;* that is, is not the proper means of producing that righteouſneſs which God requireth of us. Now, *the righteouſneſs of God*, meant in this diſcourſe by our Lord, is doubtleſs what he had been explaining to them, and contraſting to *the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees*. The phraſe *ſeeking righteouſneſs*, for ſeeking to attain a conformity to the will of God, is not unſuitable to the Jewiſh phraſeology. The ſame expreſſion occurs, 1 Macc. ii. 29. *Then many that ſought after juſtice and judgment,* ζητουντες δικαιοσυνην και κριμα, *went down into the wilderneſs to dwell there*. And though this book is not admitted by Proteſtants into the canon, it is acknowledged to have been written by a Jew, and entirely in the idiom of his country, if not originally in their language.

CHAP. VII.

3. *The thorn,* την δοκον. E. T. *The beam*. That the tropes employed by the Orientals often appear to Europeans rather too bold and hyperbolical, is beyond a doubt. But I cannot help thinking, that the effect has been, in many caſes, heightened by tranſlators, who, when a word admits different interpretations, ſeem ſometimes to have preferred that which is worſt ſuited to the figurative application. The Gr. word δοκος has, even in claſſical uſe, more latitude of ſignification than the Eng. term *beam*. It anſwers not only to the La. *trabs* or *tignum*, a *beam* or *rafter*, but alſo to *lancea*, *haſta*, a *ſpear* or *lance*. In the latter ſignification, when uſed figuratively, I take it to have been nearly ſynonymous to σκολοψ, which, from denoting *palus aculeatus*, *ſudes*, *vallus*, ſeems, at leaſt in the uſe of Helleniſts, to have been employed to denote any thing ſharp pointed (however little), as *a prickle*, or *thorn*. Thus in Num. xxxiii. 55. σκολοπες εν τοις οφθαλμοις υμων. E. T. *pricks in your eyes;* the Heb. term, to which σκολοπες anſwers, means, no more that the Eng. makes it. The Gr. word is ſimilarly rendered in the N. T. εδοθη μοι σκολοψ τη σαρκι; *there was given to me a thorn in the fleſh*. The like may be remarked of βολις, anſwering to the La. words *jaculum*, *ſagitta*, and to the Eng *miſſile weapon*, of whatever kind, *javelin*, *dart*, or *arrow*. But in the Helleniſtic uſe, it ſometimes correſponds to Heb. words, denoting no more than *prickle* or *thorn*. Thus in Joſ. xxiii. 13. εις βολιδας εν τοις οφθαλμοις υμων; E. T. *thorns in your eyes*, the word βολις is put for a Heb. term which ſtrictly means *thorn*. It is therefore evident that δοκος is uſed here by the ſame trope, and in the ſame meaning with σκολοψ and βολις in the places above quoted. And it is not more remote from our idiom to ſpeak of *a pole* or *a javelin* than to ſpeak of a *beam* in the eye. Nor is a greater liberty taken in rendering δοκος *thorn*, than in rendering βολις or σκολοψ in that manner.

6. *Or,* και. This is one of the caſes wherein και is better rendered *or* in our language than *and*. The two evils mentioned are not aſcribed to both ſorts of animals; the latter is doubtleſs applied to the *dogs*, the former to the *ſwine*. The conjunction *and* would here, therefore, be equivocal. Though the words are not in the natural order, the ſenſe cannot be miſtaken.

8. *For whoſoever aſketh obtaineth; whoſoever ſeeketh findeth*. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 29.

9. *Who amongſt you men,* τις εστιν εξ υμων ανθρωπος. E. T. *What man is there of you*. There is evidently an emphaſis in the word ανθρωπος; otherwiſe, it is ſuperfluous; for τις εστιν εξ υμων is all that is neceſſary; its ſituation at the end of the clauſe is another proof of the ſame thing. The word ανθρωπος here makes the intended illuſtration of the goodneſs of the celeſtial Father, from the conduct of even human fathers, with all their imperfections, much more energetic. I think this not ſufficiently marked in the common verſion; for *what man* is hardly any more than a tranſlation of τις.

14. *How ſtrait is the gate*. In the common Gr. we read, οτι στενη η πυλη. But in a very great number of MSS. ſome of them of great antiquity, the reading is τι, not οτι. This reading is confirmed by the Vul, *Quam anguſta porta*, and by moſt of the ancient verſions, particularly by the old Itc. both the Sy. the Ara. the Cop. the Go. and the Sax. It was ſo read by Chr. The. and the moſt eminent Fathers, Gr. and La. and is received by Wet. and ſome of the beſt modern critics.

15. *Falſe teachers* ψευδοπροφηται. E. T. *Falſe prophets*. But προφητης not only means a prophet, in our ſenſe of the word, one divinely inſpired, and able to foretel future events, but alſo a teacher in divine things. When it is uſed in the plural with the article, and refers to thoſe of former times, it always denotes the prophets in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. On moſt other occaſions it means ſimply teacher of religious truths, and conſequently ψευδοπροφητης a falſe teacher in religion. This is eſpecially to be regarded as the ſenſe in a warning which was to ſerve for the inſtruction of his diſciples in every age. I have, for the ſame reaſon, tranſlated προεφητευσαμεν, v. 22. *taught*; which, notwithſtanding its connection with things really miraculous, is better rendered thus in this paſſage, becauſe to promote the knowledge of the Goſpel is a matter of higher conſequence, and would therefore ſeem more to recommend men than to foretel things future.

20. *In the garb of ſheep,* εν ενδυμασι προβατων. Si. renders it, *Couverts de peaux de brebis*, and ſays in a note, "It is thus we ought to tranſlate *indumentis ovium*, be-

"cauſe

"cauſe the prophets were clothed with *ſheep ſkins*." It is true the author of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, xi. 37. in enumerating the great things which have been done and ſuffered, through faith, by prophets and other righteous perſons, mentions this, that they wandered about in *ſheep ſkins* and *goat ſkins*, εν μηλωταις και αιγειοις δερμασιν being deſtitute, afflicted, tormented, alluding to the perſecutions to which many of them were expoſed from idolatrous princes. That Elijah was habited in this manner, appears from 2 Ki. i. 7, 8. compared with ch. ii. 13. and 1 Ki. xix. 13. in which two laſt places, the word rendered in Eng, *mantle*, is, in the Sep. tranſlated μηλωτη. But I have not ſeen any reaſon to think that this was the common attire of the prophets. The firſt of the three paſſages ſerves as evidence, rather of the contrary, inaſmuch as Elijah ſeems to have been diſtinguiſhed by his dreſs, not only from other men, but from other prophets. That ſome indeed came afterwards hypocritically to affect a ſimilar garb, in order to deceive the ſimple, is more than probable, from Zech. xiii. 4. But, whatever be in this, as ενδυμα does not ſignify a ſkin, there is no reaſon for making the expreſſion in the tranſlation more limited than in the original.

17. *Evil tree*, σαπρον δενδρον. E. T. *Corrupt tree*. The word σαπρος does not always mean *rotten* or *corrupted*, but is often uſed as ſynonymous to πονηρος, *evil*. Trees of a bad kind produce bad fruit, but not in conſequence of any rottenneſs or corruption. See ch. xiii. 48. where, in the ſimilitude of the net, which encloſed fiſhes of every kind, the worthleſs, which were thrown away, are called τα σαπρα, rendered in the common verſion *the bad*. Nothing can be plainer than that this epithet does not denote that thoſe fiſhes were *putrid*, but ſolely that they were of a noxious or poiſonous quality, and conſequently *uſeleſs*.

23. *I never knew you*; that is, *I never acknowledged you for mine*.

23. *Ye who practiſe iniquity*, οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν. Be. *Qui operam datis iniquitati*. Diſſ. IX. P. V. § 12

28. *At his manner of teaching*, επι τη διδαχη αυτου. E. T. *At his doctrine*. The word διδαχη denotes often *the doctrine* taught, ſometimes *the act* of teaching, and ſometimes even *the manner* of teaching. That this is the import of the expreſſion here is evident from the verſe immediately following.

29. *As the Scribes*. The Vul. Sy. and Arm. verſions, with one MS. add, *and the Phariſees*.

CHAP. VIII.

4. The Sy. ſays, *the prieſts*, but in this reading is ſingular.

4. *For notifying the cure to the people*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. E. T. *For a teſtimony unto them*. Both the ſenſe and the connection ſhew that the *them* here means *the people*. It could not be *the prieſts*, for it was only one prieſt (to wit, *the prieſt* then entruſted with that buſineſs) to whom he was commanded to go. Beſides, the oblation could not ſerve as an evidence to the prieſt. On the contrary, it was neceſſary that he ſhould have ocular evidence by an accurate inſpection in private, before the man was admitted into the temple and allowed to make the oblation; but his obtaining this permiſſion, and the ſolemn ceremony conſequent upon it, was the public teſtimony of the prieſt, the only legal judge, to the people, that the man's uncleanneſs was removed. This was a matter of the utmoſt conſequence to the man, and of ſome conſequence to them. Till ſuch teſtimony was given, he lived in a moſt uncomfortable ſecluſion from ſociety. No man durſt, under pain of being alſo ſecluded, admit him into his houſe, eat with him, or ſo much as touch him. The antecedent therefore to the pronoun *them*, though not expreſſed, is eaſily ſupplied by the ſenſe. To me it is equally clear, that the only thing meant to be atteſted by the oblation was the cure. The ſuppoſitions of ſome commentators on this ſubject are quite extravagant. Nothing can be more evident than that the perſon now cleanſed was not permitted to give any teſtimony to the prieſt, or to any other, concerning the manner of his cure, or the perſon by whom it had been performed. Ορα μηδενι ειπης, *See thou tell nobody*. The prohibition is expreſſed by the Evangeliſt Mr. in ſtill ſtronger terms. Prohibitions of this kind were often tranſgreſſed by thoſe who received them; but that is not a good reaſon for repreſenting our Lord as giving contradictory orders.

6. *Afflicted*, βασανιζομενος, E. T. *Tormented*. The Greek word is not confined, eſpecially in the Helleniſtic idiom, to this ſignification, but often denotes ſimply (as has been obſerved by Gro. and Ham.) *afflicted* or *diſtreſſed*. Palſies are not attended with torment.

13. *That inſtant*, εν τη ωρα εκεινη. E. T. *In the ſelf ſame hour*. But ωρα does not always mean *hour*. This is indeed the meaning when it is joined with a number, whether ordinal or cardinal; as, He went out about *the third hour*, and, Are there not *twelve hours* in the day? On other occaſions it more commonly denotes the preciſe time, as, *Mine hour is not yet come*.

15. *Him*. The common Gr. copies have αυτοις *them*. But the reading is αυτω in a great number of MSS. ſeveral of them ancient; it is ſupported alſo by ſome of the old verſions and fathers, is approved by Mill. and Wet. and is more agreeable than the other to the words in conſtruction, none but Jeſus having been mentioned in the preceding words.

17. *Verifying the ſaying of the prophet*. We have here a remarkable example of the latitude in which the word πληροω is uſed. Ch. i. 22. N. In our ſenſe of the term *fulfilling*, we ſhould rather call that the *fulfilment* of this prophecy, which is mentioned 1 Pet. iv. 24.

I have

I have, in tranſlating the quotation, rendered ελαβε *carried off*, of which the original Heb. as well as the Gr. is capable, that the words, as far as propriety admits, may be conformable to the application.

18. *To paſs to the oppoſite ſhore.* Let it be remarked, once for all, that *paſſing* or *croſſing* this lake or ſea, does not always denote ſailing from the eaſt ſide to the weſt, or inverſely; though the river Jordan, both above and below the lake, ran ſouthwards. The lake was of ſuch a form, that, without any impropriety, it might be ſaid to be croſſed in other directions, even by thoſe who kept on the ſame ſide of the Jordan.

19. *Rabbi,* διδασκαλε. Diſſ. VII. P. II.

20. *Caverns,* φωλεους. The word φωλεος denotes *the den, cavern,* or *kennel,* which a wild beaſt, by conſtantly haunting it, appropriates to himſelf.

20. *Places of ſhelter* κατασκηνωσεις. E. T. *Neſts.* But κατασκηνωσις ſignifies a place for ſhelter and repoſe, *a perch* or *rooſt.* The Gr. name for *neſt,* or place for hatching, is νοσσια, which occurs often in this ſenſe in the Sep. as ποιοσσιω does for *to build a neſt.* But κατασκηνωσις is never ſo employed. The verb κατασκηνοω is uſed by the Evangeliſts Mt. Mr. and L. ſpeaking of birds, to expreſs their *taking ſhelter, perching,* or *rooſting* in branches. In the common verſion it is rendered by the verb *to lodge.*

22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* This expreſſion is evidently figurative; the word *dead* having one meaning in the beginning of the ſentence, and another in the end. The import is, 'Let the *ſpiritually dead,* thoſe who 'are no better than dead, being inſenſible to the con-'cerns of the ſoul and eternity, employ themſelves in 'burying thoſe who, in the common acceptation of the 'word, are *dead.*'

26. *Command d,* επετιμησε. Mr. ix. 25. N.

28. *Gadarenes.* I agree with Wet. that *Gergeſenes* appears to have been introduced by Origen upon mere conjecture. Origen's words imply as much. Before him moſt copies ſeem to have read *Gadarenes,* but ſome *Gerageſenes.* The latter is the reading of the Vul. and of the ſecond Sy. The former is preferable on many accounts, and is the reading of the firſt Sy. I ſhall only add, that if Origen's conjectural correction were to be admitted, it ought to be extended to the parallel places in Mr. and L.

20. *Demoniacs.* Diſſ. VI. P. I. § 7, &c.

29. *What haſt thou to do with us?* τι ημιν και σοι. E. T. *What have we to do with thee?* The ſenſe of both expreſſions is the ſame. But the firſt is more in the form of an expoſtulation. J. ii. 4. 20. N.

30. *At ſome diſtance,* μακραν. E. T. *A good way off.* Vul. *Non longè,* probably from ſome copy which read υ μακραν. This is one of thoſe differences wherein there is more the appearance of diſcrepancy than the reality. In ſuch general ways of ſpeaking, there is always a tacit compariſon; and the ſame thing may be denominated *far,* or *not far,* according to the extent of ground with which, in our thoughts, we compare it. *At ſome diſtance* ſuits perfectly the ſenſe of the Gr. word in this place, is conformable to the rendering given in the Sy. and makes no difference in meaning from the La. The word μακροθεν (L. xviii. 13.), where it is ſaid of the Publican μακροθεν ειστως, muſt be underſtood in the ſame way. *Afar off,* as it is rendered in the E. T. ſounds oddly in our ears, when we reflect that both the Phariſee and the publican were in the outer court of the temple, and in ſight of each other, at leaſt, if not within hearing.

CHAP. IX.

2. *Thy ſins are forgiven thee,* αφιωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι σου. E. T. *Thy ſins be forgiven thee.* The words are an affirmation, not a prayer or wiſh. As a prayer, the Scribes, would not have objected to them. At the time the common verſion was made, the words *be forgiven* were equivocal, they would now be improper. At that time *be* was often uſed in the indicative plural, for what we always ſay at preſent *are.* But even then, it would have been better in this inſtance, to ſay *are,* which was alſo uſed, and would have totally removed the ambiguity.

3. *This man blaſphemeth.* Diſſ. X. P. II. § 14.

5. *Thy ſins are forgiven.* The common editions read, αφιωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι. But there is a ſmall difference of reading here. Many MSS. and ſome verſions, amongſt which are the Sy. and the Vul. have σου inſtead of σοι, and ſome have both pronouns. I have followed, with Wet. that which ſeems beſt ſupported by number and antiquity.

8. *Wondered,* εθαυμασαν. Vul. *Timuerunt.* This doubtleſs ariſes from a different reading. Accordingly εφοβηθησαν is found in three or four MSS. agreeable to which are alſo the Sy. the Go. the Sax. and the Cop. verſions. The common reading not only has the advantage in point of evidence, but is more clearly connected with the context.

9. *At the toll office,* επι το τελωνιον. E. T. *At the receipt of cuſtom.* But the word *receipt* in this ſenſe ſeems now to be obſolete. Some late tranſlators ſay *at the cuſtom-houſe.* But have we any reaſon to think it was a houſe? The Sy. name is no evidence that it was; for, like the Hebrews, they uſe the word *beth,* eſpecially in compoſition, with great latitude of ſignification. Moſt probably it was a temporary ſtall or moveable booth, which could eaſily be erected in any place where occaſion required. The name *tollbooth,* which Ham. ſeems to have preferred, would at preſent be very unſuitable,

as that word, however well adapted in point of etymology, is now confined to the meaning of *jail* or *prison*. The word *office*, for a place where any particular buſineſs is tranſacted, whether within doors or without, is ſurely unexceptionable.

10. *Placed themſelves at table.* Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

13. *I require humanity,* ελεον θελω. E. T. *I will have mercy.* But this laſt expreſſion in Eng. means properly, *I will exerciſe mercy.* In the prophet here referred to, our tranſlators have rendered the verb much better, *I deſired.* They ought not to have changed the word here.

[2] *Humanity.* E. T. *Mercy.* The Gr. word commonly anſwers, and particularly in this paſſage, to a Heb. term of more extenſive ſignification than *mercy*, which, in ſtrictneſs denotes only beneficence to the guilty and the miſerable. This ſenſe (though Phavorinus thinks otherwiſe) is included in ελεος, which is ſometimes properly tranſlated *mercy*, but it is not all that is included. And in a general aphoriſm, like that quoted in the text, it is better to interpret the word in its full latitude.

[3] *And not ſacrifice,* for *more than ſacrifice,* a noted Hebraiſm.

[4] *To reformation,* εις μετανοιαν. Theſe words are wanting in a good many MSS. There is nothing to correſpond to them in the Vul. Sy. Go. Sax. and Eth. verſions. Critics are divided about them. To me there ſcarcely appears ſufficient evidence for rejecting them. Beſides, it is allowed by all, that if they be not expreſſed in this place, they are underſtood.

15. *Bridemen.* Mr. ii. 19. N.

16. *Undreſſed cloth,* ρακος αγναφου. E. T. *New cloth.* That this gives in effect the ſame ſenſe cannot be doubted, as it anſwers literally to the expreſſion uſed by L. who ſays ιματιω καινω. But as the expreſſions are different and not even ſynonymous; I thought it better, to allow each Evangeliſt to expreſs himſelf in his own manner.

17. *Old leathern bottles,* ασκους παλαιους. E. T. *Old bottles.* Ασκος is properly a veſſel for holding liquor. Such veſſels were commonly then, and in ſome countries are ſtill, of leather, which were not ſo eaſily diſtended when old, and were conſequently more ready to burſt by the fermentation of the liquor. As this does not hold in regard to the bottles uſed by us, I thought it better, in tranſlating, to add a word denoting the materials of which their veſſels were made.

18. *Is by this time dead,* αρτι ετελευτησεν. E. T. *Is even now dead.* Philoſtrat. αρτι, περι του καιρου των ρηματων. *By this time dead,* a natural conjecture concerning one whom he had left a-dying. As the words are evidently ſuſceptible of this interpretation, candour requires that it be preferred, being the moſt conformable to the accounts of this miracle given by the other hiſtorians.

20. *The tuft of his mantle,* του κρασπεδου του ιματιου αυτου. E. T. *The hem of his garment.* The Jewiſh mantle, or upper garment, was conſidered as conſiſting of four quarters, called in the Oriental idiom *wings,* πτερυγια. Every wing contained one corner, whereat was ſuſpended *a tuft* of threads or ſtrings, which they called κρασπεδον. See Num. xv. 37. Deut xxii. 12. What are there called *fringes,* are thoſe *ſtrings* and the four quarters of the veſture are the four *corners.* In the Sy. verſion the word is rendered קרנא, *karna, corner.* As in the firſt of the paſſages above referred to, they are mentioned as ſerving to make them remember the commandments of the Lord to do them, there was conceived to be a ſpecial ſacredneſs in them (ſee ch. xxiii. 5.), which muſt have probably led the woman to think of touching that part of his garment rather than any other. They are not properly, ſays Lamy, *des franges* in our language, but *des houpes.* See his deſcription of them and of the phylacteries, Commentarius in Harmoniam, lib. v. cap. xi. Sc. has rendered it in this place *fringe;* but this word anſwers worſe than *hem,* for their garments had no *fringes.*

27. *Son of David.* This was probably meant as acknowledging him to be the Meſſiah; for at this time it appears to have been univerſally underſtood that the Meſſiah would be a deſcendant of David.

30. *Their eyes were opened.* A Heb. idiom, neither remote nor inelegant, to denote, *They received their ſight.*

[2] *Strictly charging them, ſaid,* διεστειλατο αυτοις λεγων Vul. *Comminatus eſt illis, dicens.* Si. who tranſlates from the Vul. ſays, *Leur dit, en les menaçant rudement;* where, inſtead of ſoftening the harſh words of his author, the La. tranſlator, he has rendered them ſtill harſher. In another place, Mr. i. 43. εμβριμησαμενος αυτω λεγει is thus expreſſed in his tranſlation, *en lui diſant avec de fortes menaces.* It is ſtrange that, when the very words uſed by our Lord, on both theſe occaſions, are related by the Evangeliſt, in which there is nothing of either threat or harſhneſs, an interpreter ſhould imagine that this is implied in the verb. Si. may uſe for his apology that he tranſlates from the Vul. The Sy. tranſlator, who underſtood better the oriental idiom, renders the Gr. verb by a word in Sy. which implies ſimply *he forbade, he prohibited.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

35. *Among the people,* εν τω λαω. This clauſe is wanting in many MSS. in the Vul. the Sy. and moſt other ancient verſions. As in this caſe the evidence on the oppoſite ſides may be ſaid to balance each other, and as the admiſſion or the rejection makes no alteration in the ſenſe; that the clauſe poſſeſſes a place in the common Gr. editions, and in the E. T. is here ſufficient ground for deciding in its favour.

36. *He-*

36. *He had compaſſion upon them,* εσπλαγχνισθη περι αυτων. E. T. *He was moved with compaſſion on them.* Vul. *Miſertus eſt eis.* Be. imagining there was ſomething particularly expreſſive in the Greek verb here uſed, has rendered this clauſe *commiſeratione intima commotus eſt ſuper eis*, and is followed by Piſc. Er. ſeems to have had in ſome degree the ſame notion. He ſays, *Affectu miſericordiæ tactus eſt erga illos*, and is followed by Cal. Leo de Juda adds only *intimè* to *miſertus eſt.* Caſ. has preferred the unaffected ſimplicity of the Vul. and ſaid *miſertus eſt eorum.* Lu. has taken the ſame method. Be.'s opinion had great weight with the Proteſtant tranſlators of that age who came after him. Dio. ſays *Sene moſſe a gran pieta.* G. F. *Il fut eſmeu de compaſſion envers icelles*, which is literally the ſame with our common verſion, and which has alſo been adopted by L. Cl. The P. R. tranſlators *Ses entrailles furent emues de compaſſion.* Sa. after the Vul. ſays ſimply, *Il en eut compaſſion.* Si. to the ſame purpoſe, *Il en eut pitié.* So does Beau. who tranſlates from the Gr. Of the late Eng. tranſlations, An. Dod. Wor. and Wa. follow the common verſion. Weſ. has choſen to go beyond it, *He was moved with tender compaſſion for them.* But Wy. has in this way outſtript them all, *His bowels yearned with compaſſion on them.* Sc. and Hey. render the expreſſion as I do. Thoſe ſtrange efforts to ſay ſomething extraordinary reſult from an opinion, founded in etymology, of the ſignification of the Gr. word σπλαγχνιζομαι from σπλαγχνα, *viſcera, the bowels.* This they conſider as correſponding to the Heb. רחם *richam*, both noun and verb. The noun in the plural is ſometimes interpreted σπλαγχνα. The verb is never by the Seventy rendered σπλαγχνιζομαι, a word which does not occur in that verſion, but generally ελεεω or οικτειρω, which occur often, and are rendered *I have compaſſion, I have mercy*, or *I have pity.* Nay, the Heb. word frequently occurs joined with a negative particle, manifeſtly denoting to have no mercy, &c. Now for this purpoſe the verb *richam* would be totally unfit, if it ſignified to be affected with an uncommon degree of compaſſion; all that would be then implied in it, when joined with a negative, would be, that an uncommon degree of compaſſion was not ſhown. In the hiſtorical part of the N. T. where the word σπλαγχνιζομαι occurs pretty often, and always in the ſame ſenſe, not one of thoſe interpreters who in this paſſage find it ſo wonderfully emphatical, judge it proper always to adhere to their method of rendering adopted here, but render it barely *I have compaſſion.* Even Weſ. who has been more uniform than the reſt, has thought fit to deſert his favourite, phraſe, in tranſlating Mr. ix. 22. where the man who brought his ſon to Jeſus to be cured, ſays, as he renders it, If thou canſt do any thing, *have compaſſion on us*, σπλαγχνισθεις εφ' ημας, *and help us.* So alſo ſays Wy. Both have been ſenſible that *emotions of tender compaſſion*, and *the yearning of the bowels*, would would make but an aukward and affected figure in this place. The plea from etymology, in a point which ought to be determined ſolely by uſe, where uſe can be diſcovered, is very weak. If I ſhould render this expreſſion in Cicero, *ſtomachabatur, ſi quid aſperius dixerim*; if I happened to uſe a ſevere expreſſion, inſtantly *his ſtomach was diſordered with vexation*, I believe I ſhould be thought to tranſlate ridiculouſly. And yet the laſt clauſe is exactly in the ſame taſte with *his bowels yearned with compaſſion.* The ſtyle of the Evangeliſts is chaſte and ſimple; no effort in them to ſay extraordinary things, or in an extraordinary manner. The diction, if not, when judged by the rhetorician's rules, pure and elegant, is however natural, eaſy, and modeſt. Though they did not ſeek out fine words, the plaineſt, and, to that claſs of people with whom they were converſant, the moſt obvious, came unſought. They aimed at no laboured antitheſes, no rounded periods, no ambitious epithets, no accumulated ſuperlatives. There is a naked beauty in their manner, which is entirely their own. And with all the faults of the Vul. the barbariſms and ſoleciſms with which it is chargeable, it has, in many places, more of that beautiful but unadorned ſimplicity than moſt modern tranſlations. I ſhould not have been at ſo much pains, where there is no material difference of meaning, but to take an occaſion of ſhewing, once for all, how idly ſome beſtow their labour, hunting after imaginary emphaſis, through the obſcure mazes of etymology; a method which, in explaining any author in any language, could, with the greateſt facility, be employed to make him ſay what he never formed a conception of. Diſſ. IV. § 26.

ver. 36. *They were ſcattered and expoſed,* ησαν εκλελυμενοι και ερριμμενοι. E. T. *They fainted and were ſcattered abroad.* It is acknowledged that in a very great number of MSS. the word is not εκλελυμενοι, but εσκυλμενοι. In regard to the reading in thoſe copies, from which the Vul. and other ancient tranſlations were made, this is one of thoſe caſes in which nothing can be concluded with certainty. The reaſon is, one of the ſenſes of the word εκλελυμενοι, namely, *fatigued, exhauſted*, nearly coincideswith the meaning of εσκυλμενοι; conſequently the verſion might have been the ſame, whichſoever way it ſtood in the tranſlator's copy. Now if theſe tranſlations be ſet aſide, the preponderancy is not ſuch as ought in reaſon to determine us againſt the reading which ſuits beſt the context. To me the common reading appears, in this reſpect, preferable. Now the word εκλυω, when applied either to a flock or to a multitude of people, means *diſſipo, I ſcatter*, as well as *debilito, I weaken*; nor can any thing be better ſuited to the ſcope of the paſſage. Be. has preferred that ſenſe, and Elſner has well ſupported it, as he has in like manner, the true meaning of ερριμμενοι in this place, as ſignifying *expoſed.* This interpretation has alſo the advantage of being equally adapted to the literal ſenſe, and to the figurative; to the ſimilitude introduced, and to that with which the the compariſon is made. It is not a natural conſequence of the abſence of the ſhepherd that the ſheep ſhould be *fatigued*, and *worn out*, or *languid*, but it is the conſequence, that they ſhould be *ſcattered* and *expoſed*, to danger. The ſhepherd prevents their wandering, and protects them.

CHAP. X

2. *The firſt Simon*, πρωτος Σιμων. Though the Gr. here has no article, it is neceſſary to tranſlate it *the firſt*, otherwiſe the word *firſt* would be an adverb, and could anſwer only to πρωτον.

2. *James*, Ιακωβος. The name is the ſame with that of the Patriarch; but immemorial cuſtom has appropriated in our language the name *James* to the two Apoſtles, and *Jacob* to the Patriarch. Diſſ. XII. P. III. § 13.

3. *James, ſon of Zebedee*, Ιακωβος ὁ του Ζεβεδαιου. And,

3. *James, ſon of Alpheus*, Ιακωβος ὁ του Αλφαιου. In both the above inſtances the Gr. article ſerves merely for ſupplying the ellipſis. It occupies the place of υἱος, and is therefore more juſtly rendered *ſon* than *the ſon*.

4. *Cananite*, Καναιτης. E. T. *Canaanite*. But this is the name always given in the O. T. to a deſcendant of Canaan, ſon of Ham, and grandſon of Noah; and is in Gr. not Καναιτης but Χαναναιος. The Vul. indeed ſeems to have read ſo, rendering it *Chananæus*. But this reading is not ſupported by either verſions or MSS. nor has it any internal probability to recommend it. Some think the Gr. word imports a native or inhabitant of *Cana* in Galilee. Others are of opinion that it is a Sy. word, uſed by Mt. and Mr. of the ſame import with the Gr. word ζηλωτης employed by L. in reference to the ſame perſon. L. vi. 15. N.

4. *He who betrayed him*, ὁ και παραδους αυτον. Vul. *Qui et tradidet eum*. Er. Zu. Be. Caſ. Piſc. and Cal. all uſe *prodidet*, inſtead of *tradidit*. All modern tranſlators I am acquainted with (except Beau. and Si. who ſay, *qui livra Jeſus)*, whether they tranſlate from the Gr. or from the Vul. have in this particular followed the modern La. interpreters. Now it is evident, that in this the Vul. has adhered more cloſely both to the letter and to the ſpirit of the original than the other verſions. Παραδουναι, Wet. obſerves, is *tradere*, προδουναι is *prodere*. The former expreſſes ſimply the fact, without any note of praiſe or blame; the other marks the fact as criminal, and is properly a term of reproach. Now there is this peculiarity in the ſpirit of thoſe writers, that, when ſpeaking in their own character as hiſtorians, they ſatisfy themſelves with relating the bare facts, without either uſing ſuch terms, or affixing ſuch epithets, as might ſerve to impreſs their readers with their ſentiments concerning them, either of cenſure or of commendation. They tell the naked truth, without hinting an opinion, and leave the truth to ſpeak for itſelf. They have hit the happy medium, in narrative writing, that they avoid equally the ſlighteſt appearance, on one hand, of coldneſs and indifference, and on the other, of paſſion and prejudice. It was ſaid of their Maſter, *Never man ſpake like this man.* May it not be juſtly affirmed of theſe his biographers, *Never men wrote like theſe men?* And if their manner be unlike that of other men in general, it is more eſpecially unlike that of fanatics of all denominations. Some may be ſurpriſed, after reading this remark, that I have not myſelf uſed the more general expreſſion, and ſaid, *Delivered him up*. Had I been the firſt who rendered the Goſpels into Eng. I ſhould certainly have ſo rendered that paſſage. But the caſe is totally different, now that our ears are inured to another dialect, eſpecially as the cuſtomary expreſſion contains nothing but what is ſtrictly true. It is not eaſy to make ſo great an alteration, and at the ſame time preſerve a ſimple and unaffected manner of writing. A tranſlator, by appearing to ſeek about for an unuſual term, may loſe more of the genius of the ſtyle in one way than he gains in another. There is the greater danger in regard to this term, as, for the ſame reaſon for which we render it *deliver up* in this paſſage, we ought to tranſlate it ſo in every other, which in ſome places, in conſequence of our early habits, would ſound very aukwardly. But that the manner of the Evangeliſts may not be in any degree miſtaken from the verſion, I thought it neceſſary to add this note. Diſſ. III. § 23.

8. In the common Gr. copies, νεκρους εγειρετε, *raiſe the dead*, is found immediately after λεπρους καθαριζετε. But it is wanting in a great number of the moſt valuable MSS. in the Com. polyglot, and in the Arm. and Eth. verſions. And though it is retained in the Sy. and alſo in the Vul. where it is tranſpoſed, it is evident that Jerom did not find it in any of his beſt MSS. as he has omitted it totally in his Commentary, where every other clauſe of the ſentence is ſpecially taken notice of. Neither did Chr. Euth. or Theo. find it in the copies uſed by them. There is this further evidence againſt it, that it is not mentioned, either in the beginning of the chapter, where the powers conferred on the Apoſtles are related, whereof this, had it been granted, muſt be conſidered as the principal; or in the parallel paſſages of L. where the Apoſtles are ſaid to have been commiſſioned, and to have had powers beſtowed on them. This power they ſeem never to have received till after the reſurrection of their Lord.

9. *In your girdles*. Their purſes were commonly in their girdles.

10. *No ſcrip*, μη πηραν εις ὁδον, E. T. *No ſcrip for your journey*. I underſtand *ſcrip* to ſignify a travelling bag or wallet, and conſequently to anſwer to πηρα εις ὁδον. But whatever be in this, the words in connection ſufficiently ſhew the meaning.

10. *Staves*. The common reading in Gr. is ραβδον. This is one of the few inſtances in which our tranſlators have not ſcrupled to deſert the ordinary editions, and ſay *ſtaves*, notwithſtanding that the Vul. agrees with the common Gr. and has *virgam*. There is ſufficient ground, however, for preferring the other reading, which is not only well ſupported by MSS. ſome verſions, and old editions, and is approved by Wet. and other critics; but is entirely conformable to thoſe inſtructions as repreſented by the other Evangeliſts.

3. *Pairs*

9. *Pairs of ſhoes*, ὑποδηματα. E. T. *Shoes*. I conſider the word *two*, put before *coats*, as equally belonging to all the three articles here conjoined. For this reaſon I render ὑποδηματα *pairs of ſhoes*, becauſe it would be abſurd to repreſent it as Chriſt's order to them, 'Take not with you two ſhoes.' Nor, if regard is had to the Maſora, am I unſupported by Scripture, in thus rendering the word. In Amos, ii. 6. and viii. 6. where mention is made, as our tranſlators render it, of *ſelling the poor for a pair of ſhoes*, the word is in both places in the Sep. ſimply ὑποδηματα; whereas the Heb. word, in both places, is, in the Maſoretic editions, in the dual number, and therefore ſignifies properly a pair. I mention theſe editions, not as though there were any edition that preſented us with a different reading, but becauſe it is only in them, that the diſtinction between the dual and the plural of the maſculine nouns can be aſcertained; inaſmuch as it depends entirely on the points. I have taken the freedom to tranſpoſe the two laſt articles, *ſhoes* and *ſtaves*, for the ſake of avoiding ambiguity.

10. *Of his maintenance*, της τροφης αυτου. E. T. *Of his meat*. But the three particulars laſt mentioned, *coat*, *ſtaff*, and *ſhoes*, are ſurely not *meat*, in any ſenſe of the word. This, if there were no other argument, ſufficiently ſhews, that our lord included more under the term τροφη than *food*. He prohibits them from incumbering themſelves with any articles of raiment, beſide what they were wearing, or with money to purchaſe more, when theſe ſhould be worn out. Why? Becauſe they would be entitled to a ſupply from thoſe on whom their labours would be beſtowed, and money would be but an incumbrance to them. The word is uſed by a ſynecdoché, perfectly agreeable to the Oriental idiom, which ſometimes makes the term *bread* denote every thing neceſſary for ſubſiſtence. Sc. has ſhown that this interpretation of τροφη is not unſupported by claſſical authority.

12. The Vul. ſubjoins to this verſe, *Dicentes, Pax huic domui, Saying, Peace be to this houſe*. The correſponding words in Gr. are found in ſome MSS. but not in ſo many as to give any countenance for relinquiſhing the common reading, which agrees with the Sy. and the greater number of ancient verſions; more eſpecially, as ſome editions of the Vul. omit theſe words, and as the connection is complete without them. There is ground to think, that ſuch corrections have ſometimes ariſen from an ill-judged zeal in tranſcribers, to render the Goſpels more conformable to one another. That the common Jewiſh ſalutation was, *Peace be to this houſe*, is well known. I have, therefore, for the greater perſpicuity, rendered η ειρηνη υμων, in the 13th verſe, *the peace ye wiſh them*. This, at the ſame time that it gives exactly the ſenſe, renders the addition to the 12th verſe quite unneceſſary.

18. *To bear teſtimony to them*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. Mr. xiii. 9. N.

20. *It ſhall not be ye——but——* The meaning is, *It ſhall not be ye ſo much as——* Ch. ix. 13. 3. N.

23. *When they perſecute you in one city*, οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει ταυτη. Two or three copies, none of the moſt eſteemed, read εκ της πολεως ταυτης. Chr. and Orig. alſo, found this reading in thoſe uſed by them. But neither the author of the Vul. nor any ancient tranſlator, appears to have read ſo. Had there been ground for admitting this reading, the proper tranſlation would have been, *When they baniſh you out of one city*.

24. *Another*. Ch. xxvii. 61. N.

31. *Ye ſhall not have gone through the cities of Iſrael*, ου μη τελεσητε τας πολεις τ Ισραηλ. Be. *Nequaquam obieritis urbes Iſraelis*. The late learned Biſhop Pearce objects to this verſion that, though τελειν οδον, and τελειν alone (οδον being underſtood), are uſed for accompliſhing a journey; he had ſeen no example of τελειν πολεις, for going over, or travelling through, towns. It is ſufficient to anſwer, that we have ſeen no example of his ſenſe of the word, adapted to the phraſe here uſed; for τελειν μυστηρια, and τελειν τινα απορρητα, are at leaſt as diſſimilar to τελειν πολιν, as τελειν οδον is. Beſides, there is nothing in the ſcriptural ſtyle reſembling that of the Pagans, when ſpeaking of what they called their myſteries; though I acknowledge that a great deal of this ſort is to be found in the eccleſiaſtical writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who affected to accommodate the Pagan phraſeology to the Chriſtian doctrine and worſhip, which they not a little corrupted thereby. But nothing ſerves more ſtrongly to evince, that the ſenſe which Be. has given to the words is the natural and obvious ſenſe, than the manner in which Chr. explains this paſſage. He does not ſeem to have diſcovered, that the word τελειν, joined with πολιν, had any thing either difficult or uncommon in it; but obſerving the encouragement given to the Apoſtles in the promiſe, he thus expreſſes in his own words, as is uſual with him, the import of it, ω φθασετε περιελθοντες την Παλαιστινην, *Ye ſhall not have finiſhed your travelling through Paleſtine*. I ſhall only add, that the word *conſummabitis*, uſed by the Vul. is rather ambiguous, and may be differently interpreted. Er. Zu. and Cal. who ſay *perambulaveritis*, perfectly agree in ſenſe with Be. So, I imagine, does Caſ. though he uſes the more indefinite and leſs proper term, *perluſtraveritis*.

25. *Beelzebub*, Βεελζεβουλ. Vul. *Beelzebub*. In this inſtance, our tranſlators have adopted the reading of the Vul. in preference to that of the Gr. With the Vul. agree the Sy. Eth. and Ara. verſions. It is remarkable, that there is no variation in the Gr. MSS. all of which make the word terminate in λ, not in β. All the learned ſeem to be agreed, that Beelzebub was the Oriental name. It were ſuperfluous to examine the conjectures of critics on this ſubject. The obvious reaſon of this change appears to be that aſſigned by Gro. No Gr. word ends in β; and thoſe who wrote in that language, in order to accomodate themſelves to the pro-

nunciation of the people who ſpoke it, were accuſtomed to make ſome alterations on foreign names. Thus, Sennacherib is in the Sep. Σενναχηριμ; and Habbakkuk, for a like reaſon, is Αμβακουμ. On how many of the Heb. names of the O. T. is a much greater change made in the N. in regard to which we find no different reading in the MSS.? I ſuppoſe, however, that the reaſon of the preference given by our tranſlators, was not becauſe the ſound was more conformable to the Oriental word, a thing of no conſequence to us, but becauſe, through the univerſal uſe of the Vul. before the Reformation, men were accuſtomed to the one name, and ſtrangers to the other. The word Beelzebub means *the Lord of flies*. It is thought to be the name of ſome Syrian idol, but whether given by the worſhippers themſelves, or, as was not unuſual, by the Jews in contempt, is to us matter only of conjecture.

27. *From the houſe-tops.* Their houſes were all flat-roofed.

29. *A penny.*. Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 10.

34. *I came not to bring peace, but a ſword.* } An en-
35. *I am come to breed diſſention.* } ergetic

mode of expreſſing the certainty of a foreſeen conſequence of any meaſure, by repreſenting it as if it were the purpoſe for which the meaſure was adopted. This idiom is familiar to the Orientals, and not unfrequent in other authors, eſpecially poets and orators.

38. *He who will not take his croſs and follow me.* Every one condemned by the Romans to crucifixion, was compelled to carry the croſs on which he was to be ſuſpended, to the place of execution. In this manner our Lord himſelf was treated. As this was not a Jewiſh but a Roman puniſhment, the mention of it on this occaſion may juſtly be looked on as the firſt hint given by Jeſus of the death he was to ſuffer. If it had been uſual in the country to execute criminals in this manner, the expreſſion might have been thought proverbial, for denoting to prepare for the worſt.

39. *He who preſerveth his life ſhall loſe it.* There is in this ſentence a kind of paronomaſia, whereby the ſame word is uſed in different ſenſes, in ſuch a manner as to convey the ſentiment with greater energy to the attentive. 'He who, by making a ſacrifice of his duty, 'preſerves temporal life, ſhall loſe eternal life; and 'contrariwiſe.' The like trope our Lord employs in that expreſſion, ch. viii. 22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* Let the ſpiritually dead bury the naturally dead. See alſo ch. xiii. 12. In the preſent inſtance, the trope has a beauty in the original, which we cannot give it in a verſion. The word ψυχη is equivocal, ſignifying both *life* and *ſoul*, and conſequently is much better fitted for exhibiting, with entire perſpicuity, the two meanings, than the Eng. word *life*. The Syro-Chaldaic, which was the language then ſpoken in Paleſtine, had, in this reſpect, the ſame advantage with the Gr.

CHAP. XI.

1. *Give warning.* Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 2, &c.

1. *In the cities,* εν ταις πολεσιν αυτων. E. T. *In their cities.* It is not uncommon in the Oriental dialects, to employ a pronoun where the antecedent, to which it refers, is not expreſſed, but underſtood. In this way αυτων is here uſed; for it muſt refer to the Galileans, in whoſe country they then were. But as the pronoun is not neceſſary in Eng. and as in our ears it would appear to refer to diſciples, and ſo might miſlead, it is better omitted.

2. *Of the Meſſiah,* τα Χριστα. A few MSS. and the Eth. verſion, read τα Ιησα. It is not in itſelf improbable, that this is the true reading, though too weakly ſupported to authorize an alteration in the text. Ιησους, Κυριος, Θεος, and Χριστος, having been anciently almoſt always written by contraction, were more liable to be miſtaken than other words. If, however, the common reading be juſt, it deſerves to be remarked, that the word Χριστος, is never, when alone, and with the article, uſed in the Goſpels, as a proper name. It is the name of an office. The import of the expreſſion muſt therefore be, 'When John had heard that thoſe 'works were performed by Jeſus, which are character-'iſtical of the Meſſiah, he ſent.' Diſſ. V. P. IV. § 6—9.

3. *He that cometh,* ο ερχομενος. E. T. *He that ſhould come.* I thought it better to render this literally, becauſe it is one of the titles by which the Meſſiah was diſtinguiſhed. It anſwers in Gr. to the Heb. הבא *haba*, taken from Pſal. cxviii. 26. where he is denominated, *He that cometh in the name of the Lord.* The beginning of a deſcription is uſually employed to ſuggeſt the whole. Indeed the whole is applied to him, ch xxi. 9. Mr. xi. 9. L. xix. 38. J. xii 13. and ſometimes the abbreviation, as here, and in J. vi. 14. Heb. x. 37. ο ερχομενος ſeems to have been a title as much appropriated as ο Χριστος, and ο υιος του Δαβιδ.

5. *Good news is brought.* Diſſ. V. P. II.

6. *To whom I ſhall not prove a ſtumbling-block,* ος εαν μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι. Ch. v. 29. N.

7. *A reed ſhaken by the wind?* A proverbial expreſſion; implying, 'It is ſurely not for any trifling matter, that 'ye have gone thither.'

10. *Angel.* Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

12. *Invaded.* The compariſon is here to a country invaded and conquered, or to a city beſieged and taken by ſtorm.

13. *Were your inſtructors,* προεφητευσαν. Ch. vii. 15. N.

15. *Whoever hath ears,* &c. Diſſ. II. P. III. § 5.

16. *In*

16. *In the market-place,* ν αγοραις. E. T. *In the markets.* But a great number of MSS. as well as the Vul. Go. and Sy. verſions, have the word in the ſingular. The paſſage was alſo read thus by ſome of the ancient expoſitors. Moreover, the reading itſelf appears preferable.

17. *We have ſung mournful ſongs,* εθρηνησαμεν. E. T *We have mourned.* But mourning and lamenting are nearly ſynonymous. Hence that indiſtinctneſs in the E. T. which makes a reader at a loſs to know what thoſe children wanted of their companions. If it was to join them in mourning, it would have been more natural to retain the word, and ſay, *But ye have not mourned with us.* There are other reaſons which render this ſuppoſition improbable. One is, the former member of the ſentence ſhows, that it was one part which one of the ſets of boys had to play, and another that was expected from the other. A ſecond reaſon is, the ſimilarity of the conſtruction in the correſponding clauſes, and the difference in the contraſted; ηυλησαμεν υμιν,—εθρηνησαμεν υμιν, on one ſide, and, ουκ ωρχησασθε,—ουκ εκοψασθε on the other. Theſe things add a great degree of probability to the verſion I have given, after Er. and Cal. who ſay *lugubria cecinimus*; Dio. G. F. and L. Cl. who render the words in the ſame way, and Hey. who ſays, *ſung mournful tunes.* But what puts it, with me, beyond a doubt is, to find that the Seventy uſe θρηνος for *elegy*, or *ſong of lamentation*, and θρηνειν for *to ſing ſuch a ſong.* See 2 Sam. i. 17. For that the *lamentation* there following is a ſong or poem is evident from its ſtructure. See alſo the preamble in the Sep. to the book of Lamentations, where the ſong which immediately follows, compoſed alphabetically in the manner of ſome of the Pſalms, is denominated θρηνος, as indeed are all the other poems of that book. That the Jews uſed ſuch melancholy muſic, ſometimes inſtrumental, ſometimes vocal, at funerals, and on other calamitous occaſions, appears from ſeveral paſſages of Scripture. In Jeremiah's time, they had women whoſe occupation it was to ſing them, Jer. ix. 17. They are called in the Sep. θρηνωσαι. The word is weakly rendered in our verſion *the mourning women*; much better by Cal. *præficas*, women who, in melodious ſtrains, gave vent to their lamentations. For thoſe who know any thing of the power of muſic in conjunction with poetry will admit that theſe, by a wonderful charm, ſoothe, at the ſame time that they excite, the ſorrow of the hearers. The following words, v. 18. render the juſtneſs of this interpretation ſtill more evident. They are thus tranſlated by Houbigant, *Ut cito edant in nobis cantus lugubres, ut lachrymas effundant oculi noſtri*, &c. And in regard to the ſenſe, not much differently by Caſ. *Quæ næniam de nobis editum propere veniant*; *profundantque oculi noſtri lacrymas*, &c. In v 20. which in our verſion is unintelligible (for how mere wailing, artificially taught, could gratify a perſon in real grief, is beyond comprehenſion), the difficulty is entirely removed by a right tranſlation. Houbigant, *Inſtituite ad lamentum filias veſtras, ſuam quæque ſodalem ad cantus lugubres.* Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe, *Filias veſtras næniam, et alias aliæ lamentationem docete.* In claſſical uſe alſo θρηνειν has often the ſame ſignification, and anſwers to *næniam cdere. Nænia*, ſays Feſtus, *eſt carmen quod in funere, laudandi gratia, cantatur ad tibiam.* This ſhews the appoſiteneſs of our Lord's ſimilitude.

19. *Wiſdom is juſtified.* L. vii. 35. N.

21. *Wo unto thee Chorazin.* L. vi. 24. N.

[2] *In ſackcloth and aſhes*; that is, 'the deepeſt contri-'tion and ſorrow.' *Sackcloth and aſhes* were the outward ſigns of penitence in thoſe days.

23. *Which haſt been exalted to heaven,* η εως του ουρανου υψωθησα. Vul. *Numquid uſque in cœlum exaltaberis?* The Cop. and the Eth. verſions read in the ſame manner. In conformity to theſe, we find in a very few Gr. MSS. μη εως του ουρανου υψωθησῃ.

[2] *Hades.* Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 2, &c.

25. *I adore thee,* εξομολογουμαι σοι. E. T. *I thank thee.* The word ſometimes denotes, *to confeſs ſins*, ſometimes *to acknowledge favours*, and ſometimes alſo *to adore* or *celebrate.* It is in the laſt of theſe ſenſes I underſtand the word here. The nature of the ſentiment makes this probable. But the reaſon aſſigned, v. 26, removes all doubt, *Yes, father, becauſe ſuch is thy pleaſure.* 'Every thing in which I diſcover thy will, 'I receive, not with acquieſcence barely, but with ve-'neration.'

[2] *Having hidden theſe things,—thou haſt revealed them,* αποκρυψας ταυτα,—και απεκαλυψας αυτα. E. T. *Thou haſt hid theſe things,—and haſt revealed them.* We have the ſame idiom, Rom. vi. 17. *God be thanked that ye were the ſervants of ſin, but ye have obeyed*; the thanks are not given for their having been formerly the ſervants of ſin, but for their being then obedient, Iſ. xii. 1. rendered literally from the Heb. is, *Lord, I will praiſe thee, becauſe thou waſt angry with me, thine anger is turned away.* In interpreting this, our tranſlators have not been ſo ſcrupulous, but have rendered the middle clauſe, *though thou waſt angry with me.* I know not why they have not followed the ſame method here. *Having hidden* implies barely, *not having revealed*, Mr. iii. 4. N.

[3] *From ſages and the learned* απο σοφων και συνετων. E. T. *From the wiſe and prudent.* Σοφος, as uſed by the Evangeliſts, muſt be underſtood as equivalent to the Heb. חכם *hacham*, which, from ſignifying *wiſe* in the proper ſenſe, came, after the eſtabliſhment of academies in the country, often to denote thoſe who had the ſuperintendency of theſe ſeminaries, or a principal part in teaching. It ſeems alſo to have been uſed almoſt ſynonymouſly with *ſcribe*; ſo that in every view it ſuggeſts rather the *literary honours* a man has attained, than the *wiſdom* of which he is poſſeſſed. Συνετος anſwers to the Heb. word נבון *nabon*, which is more properly *intelligent* or *learned* than *prudent*; and both refer more to the knowledge acquired by ſtudy and application, than to what ariſes from experience and a good underſtanding. Accordingly they are here contraſted

not

not with μωροις, *fools*, but with νηπιοις, *babes*, perſons illiterate, whoſe minds had not been cultivated in the ſchools of the rabbies.

29. *Be taught by me*, μαθετε απ' εμου. E. T. *Learn of me.* The phraſe in Eng. is commonly underſtood to ſignify, *Follow my example.* But this does not expreſs the full import, which is, *Be my diſciples, be taught by me*, and is explanatory of the firſt order, *Take my yoke upon you.* See J. vi. 45. where *being taught of God*, and *learning of the Father*, are uſed as ſynonymous.

29. *Condeſcending*, ταπεινος τη καρδια. E. T. *Lowly in heart.* I think, with Elſner, that our Lord's direct aim in this addreſs is not to recommend theſe virtues in him to the imitation of the people, but himſelf to their choice as a teacher. The whole is to be explained therefore as having a view to this end. 'Be inſtructed by me, whom ye will find a meek and condeſcending teacher, not rough, haughty, and impatient, but one who can bear with the infirmities of the weak; and who, more deſirous to edify others than to pleaſe himſelf, will not diſdain to adapt his leſſons to the capacities of the learners.'

CHAP. XII.

2. *What it is not lawful.* Plucking the ears of corn they conſidered as a ſpecies of reaping, and conſequently as ſervile work, and not to be done on the Sabbath.

4. *The tabernacle*, τον οικον. E. T. *The houſe.* The temple, which is oftenest in Scripture called *the houſe of God*, was not then built. And if the houſe of the high prieſt be here denominated *God's houſe*, as ſome learned men have ſuppoſed, the application is, I ſuſpect, without example. I think, therefore, it is rather to be underſtood of the tabernacle formerly uſed, including the ſacred pavilion, or ſanctuary, and the court. Theſe, before the building of the temple, we find commonly denominated the houſe of God. Further, that it was not into the holy place that David went, appears from this circumſtance, the loaves of which he partook had been that day removed from before the Lord, and new bread had been put in their room, 1 Sam. xxi. 6. For the ſake of perſpicuity therefore, and becauſe we do not apply the word *houſe* to ſuch a portable habitation, I have thought it better to uſe ſome general name, as tabernacle or manſion, for under either of theſe terms the court or incloſure may be alſo comprehended.

4. *The loaves of the preſence*, τους αρτους της προθεσεως. E. T. *The ſhew-bread.* The Heb. expreſſion, rendered literally, is *the loaves of the face*, or *of the preſence.* This I thought it better to reſtore, than to continue in uſing a term which conveys an improper notion of the thing. Purver, whoſe verſion I have not ſeen, uſes, as I am informed, the ſame expreſſion.

5. *Violate the reſt to be obſerved on ſabbaths*, τοις σαββασιν το σαββατον βεβηλουσι. E. T. *On the ſabbath days profane the ſabbath.* This looks oddly, as though the ſabbath could be profaned on any other day. Let it be obſerved, that the Heb. word for *Sabbath* ſignifies alſo *reſt*, and is uſed in both ſenſes in this verſe. The Evangeliſt, or his interpreter, if this Goſpel was firſt written in Syro-Chaldaic, then called Hebrew, though he retained the original word, has, to hint a difference in the meaning, made an alteration on it, when introduced the ſecond time. Thus he uſes σαββασι, from σαββαι, for the *day*; but σαββατον for the ſabbatical reſt. If it be aſked, how the prieſts violate the ſabbatical reſt? the anſwer is obvious, by killing and preparing the ſacrifices, as well as by other pieces of manual labour abſolutely neceſſary in performing the religious ſervice which God had eſtabliſhed among them.

6. *Something greater*, μειζον. E. T. *A greater.* But very many MSS. and ſome ancient expoſitors read μειζον. This is alſo more conformable to the ſtyle in ſimilar caſes. See xi. 9. and in this ch. ſee the note on v. 41. and 42.

8. *Of the ſabbath*, και του σαββατου. E. T. *Even of the ſabbath.* The και is wanting here in a very great number of MSS. in ſome early editions, in the Sy. and Cop. verſions. It ſeems not to have been read by ſeveral ancient writers, and is rejected by Mill and Wetſtein, and other critics.

14. *To deſtroy him*, οπως αυτον απολεσωσι. E. T. *How they might deſtroy him.* Moſt modern tranſlations, as well as the Eng. have in this followed the Vul. which ſays, *Quomodo perderent eum.* Yet οπως is not commonly rendered *quomodo* but *ut.* There ſeems to be no MS. which has πως, elſe I ſhould have ſuſpected that this had been the reading in the copy uſed by the La. tranſlator. It is true that οπως anſwers ſometimes to *quomodo*, as well as to *ut*; but it is a good rule in tranſlating, always to prefer the uſual ſignification, unleſs it would imply ſomething abſurd, or at leaſt unſuitable to the ſcope of the place. Neither of theſe is the caſe here. If there be any difference, the ordinary acceptation is the preferable one. This is the firſt time that mention is made of a deſign on our Saviour's life. It is natural to think that the hiſtorian would acquaint us of their concurring in the deſign, before he would ſpeak of their conſulting about the means. The explanations given by the Greek Fathers ſupply, in ſome reſpects, an ancient verſion, as they frequently give the ſenſe of the original in other words. In this paſſage Chr. renders οπως by ινα *ut*, not by πως or ον τροπον *quomodo*. Συμβαλλουσιν ινα ανελωσιν αυτου.

16. *Enjoining them.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

20. *A dimly burning taper he will not quench*, λινον τυφομενον ου σβεσει. E. T. *Smoking flax ſhall he not quench.* By an eaſy metonymy the material for the thing made, *flax*, is here uſed for the *wick* of a lamp or taper, and that by a ſynecdoche, for the *lamp*, or *taper* itſelf, which, when

when near going out, yields more ſmoke than light. The Sy. Ara. and Per. render it *lamp*, Dio. ſays, *lucignuolo*. See Lowth's tranſlation of Iſaiah, xlii. 3.

23. *Is this the ſon of David?* μητι ουτος εστιν ο υιος Δαβιδ; E. T. *Is not this the ſon of David?* Vul. and Ar. *Numquid hic eſt filius David?* With this agree in ſenſe, Er. Zu. Cal. Piſc. and Caſ. only uſing *num*, not *numquid*. Be. alone ſays, *Nonne iſte eſt filius ille Davidis?* And in this he has been followed by the Eng. and ſome other Proteſtant tranſlators. The Sy. and moſt of the ancient verſions agree with the Vul. Sc. obſerves that μητι is not uſed by Mt. to interrogate negatively. He might have added, nor by any writer of the N. T. *Nonne* does not anſwer to μητι; but *num*, or *numquid*, in Eng. *whether*. Only let it be obſerved, that *whether* with us would often be ſuperfluous, when μητι in Gr. and *num* in La. would be neceſſary for diſtinguiſhing a queſtion from an affirmation. See ch. vii. 16. Mr. iv. 21. xiv. 19. L. vi. 39. 2 Cor. xii. 18. In any one of theſe places, to render it by a negative would pervert the ſenſe. Theſe are all the places wherein it occurs in this form. The only other paſſage in the N. T. where it is found is 1 Cor. vi. 3. There it has an additional particle, and is not μητι, but μητιγε, uſed for ſtating a compariſon, and rendered *how much more?* This therefore cannot be called an exception. I own, at the ſame time, that to ſay *is this*, or *is not this*, in a caſe like the preſent, makes little change in the ſenſe. Both expreſs doubtfulneſs, but with this difference, that the former ſeems to imply that *diſbelief*, the latter that *belief*, preponderates. J. iv. 29. N.

24. *This man*, ουτος. E. T. *This fellow*. Why did not our tranſlators ſay in the preceding verſe, *Is not this fellow the ſon of David?* The pronoun is the ſame in both. Our idiom, in many caſes, will not permit us to uſe the demonſtrative, without adding a noun. But as the Gr. term does not imply, a tranſlator is not entitled to add, any thing contemptuous. By ſuch freedoms, one of the greateſt beauties of theſe divine writers has been conſiderably injured. Diſſ. III. § 23.

31. *Detraction*, βλασφημια. Vul. *Blaſphemia*. E. T. *Blaſphemy*. Caſ. *Maledictum*. Er. Zu. Piſc. and Cal. *Convitium*. The Gr. word denotes injurious expreſſions, or *detraction* in the largeſt acceptation, whether againſt God or man. When God is the object, it is properly rendered *blaſphemy*. It is evident, that in this paſſage both are included, as the different kinds are compared together, conſequently the general term ought to be employed, which is applicable alike to both; whereas the term *blaſphemy*, with us, is not uſed of any verbal injury that is not aimed directly againſt God. Diſſ. X. P. II.

32. *In men is pardonable*, αφεθησεται τοις ανθρωποις. E. T. *Shall be forgiven unto men*. As the Heb. has no ſubjunctive or potential mood, the future tenſe is frequently made uſe of, for ſupplying this defect. This idiom is common in the Sep. and has been thence adopted into the N. T. It is evidently our Lord's meaning here, not that every ſuch ſin ſhall actually be pardoned, but that it is, in the divine economy, capable of being pardoned, or is *pardonable*. The words in conſtruction ſufficiently ſecure this term from being interpreted *venial*, as it ſometimes denotes. The words *remiſſible* and *irremiſſible*, would have been leſs equivocal, but are rather technical terms, than words in common uſe.

32. *Againſt the ſpirit*. Diſſ. X. P. II. § 17.

32. *In the preſent ſtate,—in the future*, εν τουτω τω αιωνι, —εν τω μελλοντι. E. T. *In this world,—in the world to come*. The word *ſtate* ſeems to ſuit better here than either *age*, which ſome prefer, or *world*, as in the common verſion. Admit, though by no means certain, that by the two αιωνες are here meant the *Jewiſh* diſpenſation and the *Chriſtian*. Theſe we cannot in Eng. call ages; as little can we name them *worlds*. The latter implies too much, and the former too little. But they are frequently and properly called *ſtates*. And as there is an ambiguity in the original (for the firſt clauſe may mean the preſent life, and the ſecond the life that follows), the Eng. word *ſtate* is clearly ſuſceptible of this interpretation likewiſe. And though I conſider it as a ſcrupuloſity bordering on ſuperſtition, to preſerve in a verſion every ambiguous phraſe that may be found in the original, where the ſcope of the paſſage, or the words in conſtruction, ſufficiently aſcertain the ſenſe; yet where there is real ground to doubt about the meaning, one does not act the part of a faithful tranſlator, who does not endeavour to give the ſentiment in the ſame latitude to his readers in which the author gave it to him. This may not always be poſſible; but, where it is poſſible, it ſhould be done. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 23.

35. *Out of his good treaſure*, εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας. E. T. *Out of the good treaſure of the heart*. But the words της καρδιας are wanting in ſo many MSS. even thoſe of the greateſt note, ancient verſions, and commentators, that they cannot be regarded as authentic. Pearce, through I know not what inadvertency, has ſaid that the word here ſhould be rendered *treaſury*. *The treaſury* is the place where treaſure is depoſited, which may be a very noble edifice, though all the treaſure it contains be good for nothing. Now a man's producing good things is ſurely an evidence of the goodneſs; not of his *ſtore-houſe*, but of his *ſtores*.

36. *Pernicious word*, ρημα αργον. E. T. *Idle word*. Caſ. *Malum verbum*. The epithet αργος, when applied to words, has been ſhown by ſeveral to denote *pernicious*, *falſe*, *calumnious*. To this ſenſe the context naturally leads. In the primitive meaning *idle*, it is applicable only to perſons. When it is applied to things, as the words or actions of men, it is underſtood to denote ſuch in quality as ſpring from habitual idleneſs. And in this claſs the Jews were wont to rank almoſt all the vices of the tongue, particularly *lying* and *defa-*

mation.

mation. See 1 Tim. v. 13. Conſider alſo the import of the phraſe γαστερες αργοι, in the character given of the Cretans, Tit. i. 12. This, if we render the word αργος as in the text, is *idle bellies*, which, if we were to interpret it by our idiom, ought to denote *abſtemiouſneſs*, as in the abſtemious the *belly* may be ſaid to be comparatively *idle* or unemployed. Yet the meaning is certainly the reverſe. The author's idea is rather *bellies of the idle*, thoſe who ſpend their time merely in pampering themſelves. I am far from intending, by this remark, to ſignify that what we commonly call *idle*, that is vain and unedifying, *words*, are not ſinful, and conſequently to be brought into judgment. If theſe be not comprehended in the ρηματα αργα of this paſſage, they may well be included in the μαρολογια, *fooliſh talking*, mentioned by the Apoſtle, Eph. v. 4.

37. *Or*, και. As both clauſes in this verſe cannot be applied to the ſame perſon, this is one of the caſes wherein the copulative is properly rendered *or*.

38. *A ſign*; that is, 'a miracle in proof of thy 'miſſion.'

39. *Adulterous*, μοιχαλις. Vul. *Adultera*. "This "may be underſtood," ſays Si. "ſuitably to the ſym-"bolical phraſeology of ancient prophecy, as denoting "*infidel, apoſtate.*" He has accordingly, in his tranſlation, rendered it *infidele*. I cannot help obſerving, that if this had been the rendering in the verſion of P. R. which here keeps the beaten road, and ſays *adultere*, we ſhould have been told by that critic, that the term employed by thoſe interpreters was not a tranſlation, but a comment, which they ought to have reſerved for the margin. And I muſt acknowledge, that he would have had, in this place, more ſcope for the diſtinction, than in many places wherein he urges it. For it is very far from being evident that our Saviour here adopts the allegorical ſtyle of the prophets. Beſides, in their ſtyle, it is *ido'atry*, and not *infidelity*, which in Jews is called *adultery*. And with *idolatry* we do not find them charged in the N. T.

40. *Of the great fiſh*, τυ κητους. E. T. *The whale's*. But κητος is not a *whale*, it is a general name for any huge fiſh, or *ſea-monſter*. It was the word uſed by the *Seventy*, properly enough, for rendering what was ſimply called, in Jonah, a *great fiſh*.

41. *They were warned by Jonah*. Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 2.

41, 42. *Something greater*, πλειον. E. T. *A greater*. There is a modeſty and a delicacy in the uſe made of the neuter gender in theſe verſes, which a tranſlator ought not to overlook. Our Lord chuſes, on this occaſion, rather to inſinuate, than to affirm, the dignity of his character; and to afford matter of reflection to the attentive amongſt his diſciples, without furniſhing his declared enemies with a handle for contradiction.

44. *Furniſhed*, κεκοσμημενον. E. T. *Garniſhed*. κοσμεω ſignifies *I adorn*, commonly, when applied to a perſon, *with apparel*, and to a houſe, *with furniture*. This in old Eng. has probably been the meaning of the word *to garniſh*, agreeably to the import of its Fr. etymon, *garnir*.

46. *Brothers*. It is almoſt too well known to need being mentioned, that in the Heb. idiom near relations, ſuch as nephews and couſins, are often ſtyled *brothers*. The O. T. abounds with examples.

CHAP. XIII.

3. *In parables*, εν παραβολαις. The word παραβολη, as uſed by the Evangeliſts, has all the extent of ſignification in which the Heb. משל *maſhal* is uſed in the O. T. It not only means what we call *parable*, but alſo compariſon of any kind, nay *proverb*, *prediction*, or any thing figuratively or poetically expreſſed, ſometimes any moral inſtruction, as L. xiv. 7. Our tranſlators have not always rendered it *parable*. They call it *compariſon*, Mr. iv. 30. *proverb*, L. iv. 23. *figure*, Heb. ix. 9. xi. 19. They have, however, retained the word *parable* in ſeveral places, where they had as good reaſon to change it as in thoſe now mentioned. A *parable*, in the ordinary acceptation of the word in Eng. is a ſpecies of compariſon. It differs from an *example*, in which there is properly no ſimilitude, but an inſtance in kind. Of this ſort is the ſtory of the Phariſee and the Publican, who went up to the temple to pray; of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the compaſſionate Samaritan; alſo that of the fool, who, when his ſtores were encreaſed, flattered himſelf that he had a ſecurity of enjoyment for many years. Nor is it every ſort of compariſon. What is taken entirely from ſtill life we ſhould hardly call a parable. Such is the compariſon of the kingdom to a grain of muſtard ſeed, and to leaven. Rational and active life ſeems always to enter into the notion. Further, the action muſt be feaſible, or at leaſt poſſible. Jotham's fable of the trees chooſing a king, is properly an *apologue*; becauſe, literally underſtood, the thing is impoſſible. There is alſo a difference between *parable* and *allegory*. In *allegory* (which is no other than a leſſon delivered in metaphor) every one of the principal words has, through the whole, two meanings, the literal and the figurative. Whatever is advanced ſhould be pertinent, underſtood either way. The allegory is always imperfect where this does not hold. It is not ſo in parable, where the ſcope is chiefly regarded, and not the words taken ſeverally. That there be a reſemblance in the principal incidents is all that is required. Smaller matters are conſidered only as a ſort of drapery. Thus, in the parable of *the prodigal*, all the characters and chief incidents are ſignificant, and can ſcarcely be miſunderſtood by an attentive reader; but to attempt to aſſign a ſeparate meaning to *the beſt robe*, and *the ring*, and *the ſhoes*, and *the fatted calf*, and *the muſic*, and *the dancing*, betrays great

great want of judgment, as well as puerility of fancy. In thoſe inſtructions of our Lord, promiſcuouſly termed *parables*, there are ſpecimens of all the different kinds above mentioned, *apologue* alone excepted. Let it be obſerved, that it matters not whether the relation itſelf be true hiſtory or fiction. The truth of the parable lies in the juſtneſs of the application.

4. *The ſower*, ὁ σπειρων. E. T. *A ſower*. The article here is, in my opinion, not without deſign, as it ſuggeſts that the application is eminently to one individual.

5. *Rocky ground*, τα πετρωδη. E. T. *Stony places*. But this does not expreſs the ſenſe. There may be many looſe ſtones, from which the place would properly be denominated *ſtony*, where the ſoil is both rich and deep. What is meant here is evidently continued rock, with a very thin cover of earth.

9. *Whoever hath ears*. Diſſ. II. P. III. § 5.

11. *The ſecrets*, τα μυστηρια. E. T. *The myſteries*. That the common ſignification of μυστηρια is, as rendered by Caſ. *arcana*, there can be no doubt. Diſſ. IX. P. I. The moral truths here alluded to, and diſplayed in the explanation of the parable, are as far from being myſteries, in the common acceptation, *doctrines incomprehenſible*, as any thing in the world can be.

12. *To him that hath*. Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

14. *Is fulfilled*, αναπληρουται. I am not poſitive that the compound verb αναπληροω means more than the ſimple πληροω, which, for a reaſon aſſigned above (note on ch. i. 22.), I commonly tranſlate *verify*. But as the word here is particular, and not uſed in any other paſſage of the Goſpels, and as ανα in compoſition is ſometimes what grammarians call intenſive, I have imitated the Evangeliſt in changing the word. Though it is evident, from the paſſage in Iſaiah, that the character quoted was that of the people in the prophet's time; we have reaſon to think that there muſt have been in the deſcription a ſpecial view to the age of the Meſſiah, which the obduracy of Iſaiah's contemporaries was exhibited chiefly to prefigure; for, of all the paſſages in the O. T. relating to theſe events, this is that which is the oftneſt quoted in the New.

15. *Underſtanding*, καρδια. Diſſ. IV. § 23.

16. *Bleſſed*, μακαριοι. Though I commonly render this word *happy*, to diſtinguiſh it from ευλογητος, I do not think the application of the word *happy* in this verſe would ſuit the Eng. idiom.

19. *Mindeth it not*, μη συνιοντος. E. T. *Underſtandeth it not*. Be. and Piſc. *Non attendit*. Beau. *Ne la goute point*. P. R. and Sa. *N'y fait point d'attention*. That the verb συνιημι frequently means, both in the Sep. and in the N. T. *to mind, to regard, to attend to*, is unqueſtionable. See Pſ. xli. 1. cvi. 7. Prov. xxi. 12. Rom. iii. 11. In two of theſe paſſages the common tranſlation has *conſidereth*; and though the verb *underſtand* is uſed in the other two, the context makes it manifeſt, that the meaning is the ſame. In the paſſage under review, An. Hey. Weſ. uſe the verb *conſider*; Wor. and Wa. *regard*. This remark affects alſo v. 13.

19, &c. *That which ſe'l*, &c. ὁ σπαρεις. E. T. *He which received ſeed*. I agree with Ham. in thinking that ὁ σπορος, *the ſeed*, a word in common uſe both in the Sep. and in the N. T. is here underſtood. It is this which alone can be ſaid to be ſown, and not the perſons who are figured by the different ſoils. In the other way of explaining it, there is ſuch a jumble of the literal ſenſe and of the figurative, as preſents no image to the mind, and is unexampled in holy writ.

[a] ΕΣΤΙ, in ſuch caſes, is properly rendered *denotes*.

21. *He relapſeth*, σκανδαλιζεται. E. T. *He is offended*. For the general import of the Gr. word, ſee the note on ch. v. 29. The preciſe meaning in this paſſage is plainly indicated by the connection. Notice is taken of a temporary convert made by the word, whom perſecution cauſes to relapſe into his former ſtate. Caſ. renders it *deficit*. This is agreeable to the ſenſe, and an exact verſion of the word αφιστανται uſed in the parallel place, L. viii. 13.

24. *May be compared to a field, in which the proprietor had ſown good grain*, ωμοιωθη ανθρωπω σπειροντι καλον σπερμα εν τω αγρω αυτου. It is admitted on all ſides that, in tranſlating theſe ſimilitudes, the words ought not to be traced with rigour. The meaning is ſufficiently evident.

25. *Darnel*, ζιζανια. E. T. *Tares*. Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Piſc. *Zizania*. Caſ. (becauſe *zizanium* is not Lat.) has choſen to employ a general appellation, and ſay, *Malas herbas*. It appears from the parable itſelf, 1ſt, That this weed was not only hurtful to the corn, but otherwiſe of no value, and therefore to be ſevered and burnt. 2dly, That it reſembled corn, eſpecially wheat, ſince it was only when the wheat was putting forth the ear that theſe weeds were diſcovered. Now neither of theſe characters will ſuit *the tare*, which is excellent food for cattle, and ſometimes cultivated for their uſe; and which, being a ſpecies of vetch, is diſtinguiſhed from corn from the moment it appears above ground. Lightfoot obſerves that the Talmudic name anſwering to ζιζανιον is זונין *zonin*, which is probably formed from the Gr. and quotes this ſaying, *Triticum et zonin non ſunt ſemina heterogenea*. Chr. remarks to the ſame purpoſe, ουκ αλλο τι σπερμα, αλλα ζιζανια καλει, ὁ και κατα την οψιν, ἐοικε πως τω σιτῳ, "he "mentions no other weed but *zizania*, which, in its "appearance, bears a reſemblance to wheat." It may be remarked by the way, that Chr. ſpeaks of it as a

plant at that time known to every body. Now, as it cannot be *the tare* that is meant, it is highly probable that it is the *darnel*, in La. *lolium*, namely, that ſpecies called by botaniſts *temulentum*, which grows among corn, not the *lolium perenne*, commonly called *ray*, and corruptly *rye-graſs*, which grows in meadows. For, 1ſt, This appears to have been the La. word by which the Gr. was wont to be interpreted. 2dly, It agrees to the characters above mentioned. It is a noxious weed; for when the ſeeds happen to be mingled and ground with the corn, the bread made of this mixture always occaſions ſickneſs and giddineſs in thoſe who eat it; and the ſtraw has the ſame effect upon the cattle: it is from this quality, and the appearance of drunkenneſs which it produces, that it is termed *yvraie* in Fr. and has the ſpecific name *temulentum* given it by botaniſts. And probably for the ſame reaſon it is called by Virgil, *infelix lolium*. It has alſo a reſemblance to wheat ſufficient to juſtify all that relates to this in the parable, or in the above quotations. By that ſaying, *non ſunt ſemina heterogenea*, we are not to underſtand, with Lightfoot, that they are of the ſame genus, but that they are of the ſame claſs or tribe. Both are comprehended in the *gramina*; nay more, both terminate in a bearded ſpike, having the grains in two oppoſite rows. All the Fr. tranſlations I have ſeen render it *yvraie*. Dio. *zizzanie*, which, in the Vocabolario della Cruſca, is explained by the La. *lolium*. Thoſe who render it *cockle* are as far from the truth as the common verſion. The only Eng. tranſlation in which I have found the word *darnel* is Mr. Weſley's.

32. *The ſmalleſt of all ſeeds*; that is, of all thoſe ſeeds with which the people of Judea were then acquainted. Our Lord's words are to be interpreted by popular uſe. And we learn from this Goſpel, xvii. 20. that *like a grain of muſtard ſeed* was become proverbial for expreſſing a very ſmall quantity.

Becometh a tree. That there was a ſpecies of the *ſinapi*, or at leaſt what the Orientals comprehended under that name, which roſe to the ſize of a tree, appears from ſome quotations brought by Lightfoot and Buxtorf, from the writings of the Rabbies, men who will not be ſuſpected of partiality, when their teſtimony happens to favour the writers of the N. T.

33. *Meaſures*, σατα. The word denotes a particular meaſure; but as we have none correſponding to it, and as nothing ſeems to depend on the quantity, I have, after our tranſlators, uſed the general name, ch. v. 15. N.

35. *Things whereof all antiquity hath been ſilent*, κεκρυμμενα απο καταβολης κοσμου. E. T. *Things which have been kept ſecret from the foundation of the world.* The Evangeliſt has not followed literally either the Heb. הודות מני קדם, or the verſion of the Seventy, προβλημματα απ' αρχης, but has faithfully given the meaning. I have endeavoured to imitate him in this, attaching myſelf more to the ſenſe than to the letter. This is in a more eſpecial manner allowable in tranſlating quotations from a poem. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 10. As to the phraſe καταβολη κοσμου, ſee ch. xxv. 34. N.

39. *Concluſion of this ſtate*, συντελεια του αιωνος. E. T. *The end of the world*; αιων, *ſtate*, ch. xii. 32. N. I commonly render τελος *end*, συντελεια *concluſion*.

41. *All ſeducers*, παντα σκανδαλα. This term commonly denotes the actions or things which enſnare or ſeduce; here it is the perſons, being joined with τους ποιουντας, and is therefore rendered ſeducers.

55. *The carpenter's ſon*, ὁ του τεκτονος υἱος. Some affirm that all the evidence we have that Joſeph was a *carpenter* is from tradition; that the word uſed in the Goſpels means *artificer* in general, at leaſt, one who works in wood, ſtone, or metal. I admit that the Gr. τεκτων anſwers nearly to the Lat. *faber*, which, according to the word accompanying it, as *lignarius*, *ferrarius*, *ærarius*, *eboris*, or *marmoris*, expreſſes different occupations. Thus, we have alſo, τεκτων ξυλων, σιδηρου, χαλκου, λιθων, for ſo many ſorts of artificers. But there is no inconſiſtency in ſaying alſo, that when the word is uſed alone, it commonly denotes one of theſe occupations only, and not any of them indifferently. That this is actually the caſe with this word in the uſage of the ſacred writers; and that when it is by itſelf, it implies *a carpenter*; may be proved by the following, amongſt other paſſages, in the Sep. 2 Ki. xxii. 6. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12. xxxiv. 11. Ezr. iii. 7. Iſ. xli. 7. Zech. i. 20. On the other hand, I have not found a ſingle paſſage where it is employed in the ſame manner, to denote a man of a different occupation. There is ſomething analogous, though the words are not equivalent, in the uſe of the word *ſmith* with us. It is employed in compoſition to denote almoſt every artificer in metal, the ſpecies being aſcertained by the word compounded with it. Hence we have *goldſmith*, *ſilverſmith*, *copperſmith*, *lockſmith*, *gunſmith*, *blackſmith*. But if we uſe the word *ſmith*, ſimply, and without any thing connected to confine its ſignification, we always mean *blackſmith*.

57. *They were ſcandalized at him*, εσκανδαλιζοντο εν αυτω. E. T. *They were offended in him.* This is one of the few inſtances in which the Eng. verb, *ſcandalize*, expreſſes better the ſenſe of the Gr. than any other in the language. To be *ſcandalized*, is to be offended on account of ſomething ſuppoſed criminal or irreligious. This was the caſe here. Their knowledge of the meanneſs of our Lord's birth and education, made them conſider him as guilty of an impious uſurpation, in aſſuming the character of a Prophet, much more in aſpiring to the title of Meſſiah. The verb, *to be offended*, does not reach the ſenſe, and *to be offended in*, can hardly be ſaid to expreſs any thing, becauſe not in the idiom of the tongue. Ch. v. 29. N.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

1. *Tetrarch*, τετραρχης. Properly, the governor of the fourth part of a country; commonly uſed as a title inferior to *king*, and denoting chief ruler. The perſon here ſpoken of was Antipas, a ſon of Herod the Great. The name *king* is ſometimes given to tetrarchs. See verſe 9.

3. *Philip's*. The name is not in the Vul. nor in the Cam. MS. It is in the Sax.

6. *But when Herod's birth-day was kept*, γενεσιων δε αγομενων τε Ηρωδε. Some think, that by γενεσια is here meant the day of Herod's acceſſion to his tetrarchy. The word may ſometimes be uſed with this latitude; but unleſs where there is poſitive evidence that it has that meaning, the ſafer way is to prefer the cuſtomary interpretation.

9. *The king was ſorry, nevertheleſs, from a regard to his oath*, &c. In how diſpaſſionate a manner, and with what uncommon candour does Mt. relate this moſt atrocious action! No exclamation! no exaggeration! no invective! There is no allowance, which even the friend of Herod would have urged in extenuation of his guilt, that this hiſtorian is not ready to make. *He was ſorry, nevertheleſs, from a regard to his oath, and his gueſts*— The remark of Raphelius on the whole ſtory is ſo pertinent, that I cannot avoid ſubjoining it: "Vide, quanta ſimplicitate rem narret, ne graviori "quidem verbo factum indigniſſimum notans. Neque "hæc aliter ſcribi opportuit. Ne quis igitur forſan "imperitior iſta aſpernetur, quaſi craſſo nimis filo, "nulloque artificio, ſint contexta: aliis formis alia or-"namenta conveniunt. Hanc, quam Matthæus ſer-"moni ſuo induit, nativus maximè color, et nuda re-"rum expoſitio honeſtat."

13. *By land*, πεζη. E. T. *On foot*. The Gr. word has unqueſtionably both ſignifications. It means *on foot*, when oppoſed to *on horſeback*; and *by land*, when contraſted with *by ſea*.

15. *Towards the evening*. See verſe 23. N.

19. *Bleſſed them*, ευλογησε. E. T. *He bleſſed*. With us, *to bleſs* is an active verb; and it may be aſked, Whom, or what, did he bleſs? The words in connection lead us to apply it to the loaves. Thus, *He bleſſed, and brake, and gave the loaves*. Oriental uſe, however, would incline us to think that the meaning is, *bleſſed God*; that is, gave thanks to him. Thus, in the other miracle of the ſame kind, recorded in the next chapter, inſtead of ευλογησας, we have ευχαριστησας, *having given thanks*. See alſo Mr. viii. 6. J. vi. 11. The ſame thing takes place in the accounts given by the ſacred writers of the laſt ſupper. What one calls ευλογησας, another calls ευχαριστησας. This would make us ſuſpect the terms to be ſynonymous. But as we find the word ευλογεω applied, L. ix. 16. and 1 Cor. x. 16. to the things diſtributed, it is better here to give it the interpretation to which the conſtruction evidently points. The Jews have, in their rituals, a prayer uſed on ſuch occaſions, which they call ברכה *brachah*, that is, the *bleſſing*, or *benediction*. It is probable, that no more was meant by either verb, than that he ſaid ſuch a prayer.

23. *It was late*. It may appear ſtrange to an ordinary reader, that the ſame phraſe, οψιας γενομενης, is uſed, v. 15. to expreſs the time when his diſciples applied to him to diſmiſs the multitude, which was immediately before he fed them miraculouſly in the wilderneſs, and now after they had eaten and were diſmiſſed, after the diſciples were embarked, and had ſailed half way over the ſea of Galilee; and after he himſelf had retired to a mountain, and been occupied in prayer, the time is repreſented by the ſame phraſe, οψιας γενομενης. Let it be obſerved, for the ſake of removing this difficulty, that the Jews ſpoke of two evenings: the firſt was conſidered as commencing from *the ninth hour*; that is, in our reckoning, *three o'clock afternoon*; the ſecond from *the twelfth hour*, or *ſunſet*. This appears from ſeveral paſſages of the O. T. In the inſtitution of the paſſover, for inſtance, the people are commanded (Ex. xii. 6.) to kill the lamb *in the evening*. The marginal reading, which is the literal verſion of the Heb. is *between the two evenings*; that is, between three and ſix o'clock afternoon. What is ſaid, therefore, v. 15. denotes no more, than that it was about three; what is ſaid here implies, that it was after ſunſet. The attendant circumſtances remove all ambiguity from the words. But as it was impoſſible to make this peculiarity in the idiom perſpicuous in a tranſlation, I have given, in the verſion, the import which the phraſe has in the different places, and have added this explanation for the ſake of the unlearned. Mr. xv. 42. N.

33. *A ſon of God*, υιος θεε. E. T. *The Son of God*. In regard to the title ὁ υιος τε θεε, which alone expreſſes definitely *the Son of God*, Mt. mentions it only once as given, by any man, to our Lord, before his reſurrection; and that was in the memorable confeſſion made by Peter, ch. xvi. 16. which gave occaſion to a remarkable declaration and promiſe. It may be aſked, Did not thoſe mariners mean that our Lord was the Meſſiah, and, by conſequence, more eminently than any other, *the Son of God?* It is not certain that this declaration implies their belief in him as the Meſſiah: they might intend only to ſay that he was a Prophet; for ſuch are denominated ſons of God: but ſuppoſing they meant the Meſſiah, we know too well the notions which at that time obtained univerſally concerning the Meſſiah, as a temporal deliverer, to conclude that they annexed to the appellation, *Son of God*, aught of that peculiarity of character which Chriſtians now do, on the beſt authority. If, inſtead of *God*, we ſhould ſay, *a God*, the

verſion would be ſtill more literal, and perhaps more juſt. Some think that thoſe mariners were Pagans, of whom there was a great mixture in ſome places on the coaſts of this lake. If they were, *the Son of a God* would be the proper expreſſion of their meaning. Ch. xxvii. 54. N.

35. *That country*, την περιχωρον εκεινην. E. T. *That country round about*. Mr. i. 28. N.

CHAP. XV.

1. *Of Jeruſalem*, απο Ιεροσολυμων. That απο, before the name of a place, often denotes ſimply *of*, or *belonging to*, and not *from*, that place, many proofs might be brought from claſſical writers, as well as from ſacred. Of the latter ſort, the three examples following ſhall ſuffice: J. xi. 1. Acts xvii. 13. Heb. xiii. 24.

4. *Revileth*, κακολογων. E. T. *Curſeth*. I am aſtoniſhed that modern tranſlators have ſo generally rendered the Gr. κακολογειν, by the word *to curſe*, or ſome equivalent term. *To curſe*, that is, to pray imprecations, is always expreſſed in the N. T. by καταρασμαι, αναθεματιζω, καταναθεματιζω; *a curſe*, by καταρα, αναθεμα, κατανάθεμα; *curſed*, by κατηραμενος and επικαταρατος. The proper import of the word κακολογειν, is *to give abuſive language*, to revile, to calumniate. It may, indeed, be ſaid juſtly, that *curſing*, as one ſpecies of abuſive words, is alſo included. But it is very improper to confine a term of ſo extenſive ſignification to this ſingle particular. Nay more, the application, in the preſent inſtance, is evidently to reproachful words quite different from curſing. Our Lord, by quoting both the commandment and the denunciation againſt the oppoſite crime, has ſhown, that the Phariſees not only allowed the omiſſion, but, in a certain caſe, prohibited the obſervance of the duty; nay, which is worſe, made no account of the commiſſion of a crime which, by the law, had been pronounced capital. Firſt, They had deviſed for children an eaſy method of eluding the obligation to maintain their indigent parents, which is implied in *the honour* enjoined by the precept; and, ſecondly, They made light of a man's treating his parent abuſively, when they permitted him to ſay with impunity, "I devote whatever of mine ſhall pro-"fit thee;" which, though not properly curſing his parent, was threatening him, and venting an implicit imprecation againſt himſelf, that he might be held guilty of perjury and ſacrilege, if ever he contributed to his ſupport. This I take to be the κακολογια, the abuſe, of which our Lord ſignifies, that, inſtead of being the means of releaſing them from the obſervance of an expreſs command of God, was itſelf a crime of the moſt heinous nature. The Heb. verb is קלל *kalal*, the ſignification of which is equally extenſive with that of the Gr. and it has, in ſome places of the O. T. been as improperly rendered as the Gr. is in the N. In none, indeed, more remarkably than in Nehem. xiii. 25. where the inſpired writer ſays only, *I reproached them*, our interpreters have, not very decently, made him ſay, *I curſed them*. The Heb. *kalal*, and the Gr. *cacologeo*, are both rightly rendered, by all the Lat. tranſlators, *maledico*, a term exactly of the ſame import. But thoſe Gr. words above quoted, which ſignify properly *to curſe*, are rendered very differently by them all. For this purpoſe, they uſe *imprecor, execror, deteſtor, devoveo, diris ago*, and *anathematizo*. The verb καταραομαι, is only once in the Vul. tranſlated *maledico*; and into this I imagine the tranſlator has been led, by an inclination to verbal antitheſis, which has often occaſioned a greater deviation from the ſenſe. *Benedicite maledicentibus vobis*. The only Eng. verſions I have ſeen, which render κακολογων *revileth*, are Wef.'s Wor.'s and Wa.'s. Sa. after the verſion of P. R. has well expreſſed the ſenſe in Fr. by a periphraſis, *qui aura outragé de paroles*.

5. *I devote*. Mr. vii. 11. N.

2. *Honour by his aſſiſtance*. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 15.

8. *This people addreſs me with their mouth, and honour me with their lips*. Εγγιζει μοι ο λαος ουτος τω στοματι αυτων, και τοις χειλεσι με τιμα. Vul. *Populus hic labiis me honorat*. There is nothing to anſwer to theſe words, εγγιζει μοι τω στοματι αυτων και: the like defect is in the Sy. the Cop. the Sax. the Eth. and the Arm. verſions. The words are alſo wanting in three MSS. The paſſage in the prophecy quoted, is agreeable to the common reading.

9. *Inſtitutions merely human*, ενταλματα ανθρωπων. E. T. *The commandments of men*. The word ενταλμα occurs but thrice in the N. T. namely here, in the parallel place, Mr. vii. 7. and in Col. ii. 22. In all theſe places it is joined with ανθρωπων; as it is alſo in the paſſage of the Sep. here quoted. Moreover, in all theſe places, the ενταλματα are mentioned with evident diſapprobation, and contraſted, by implication, with the precepts of God, which, in the N. T. are never denominated ενταλματα, but εντολαι. For theſe reaſons, I thought it more ſuitable to the original, to diſtinguiſh them in the verſion.

12. *Scandalized*. Ch. xiii. 57. N.

15. *Saying*, παραβολην. E. T. *Parable*. What Peter wanted to be explained, as the following words ſhew, was that ſentence, maxim, or proverb, we have in v. 11. *It is not what goeth into the mouth*—This, on no principle, could be rendered *parable*, except that of Ar. of always tranſlating the ſame word by the ſame word; a principle which our interpreters have not often followed, in regard to this or any other term. Ch. xiii. 3. N.

17. *The ſink*. Mr. vii. 19. N.

22. *Maſter*,

22. *Maſter*, κυριε. Diſſ. VII. P. I.

26. *To the dogs*, τοις κυναριοις. Our Lord, in this expreſſion, did but adopt the common ſtyle of his countrymen the Jews, in relation to the Gentiles, to whom this woman belonged; and he did this evidently with a view to make the reflection in v. 28. ſtrike more ſeverely againſt the former.

30, 31. *The cripple*, κυλλους. E. T. *maimed*. Though *maimed* is ſometimes expreſſed by κυλλος, the Gr. word is not confined to this ſenſe, but denotes equally one who wants a limb, and one who has not the uſe of it. In a relation, ſuch as this, it ought to be rendered in its fulleſt latitude. Where the context ſhews it refers to one deprived of a member, as xviii. 8. it ſhould be *maimed*. In v. 31. there is nothing in the Vul. Cop. Ara. Eth. and Sax. verſions anſwering to κυλλους ὑγιεις.

32. *Leſt their ſtrength fail*, μηποτε εκλυθωσιν. E. T. *Leſt they faint*. Vul. *Ne deficiant*. Be. more explicitly, *Ne viribus deficiant*. Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe, *Ne defatiſcantur*. None of theſe implies ſo much as the Eng. *to faint*. The Lat. phraſe, correſponding to it, is *animi deliquium pati*. It appears, indeed, from ſeveral paſſages in the Bible, that when the common tranſlation was made, the Eng. verb, *to faint*, meant no more than what we ſhould now expreſs by the phraſe, *to grow faint*, to become languid, to fail either in ſtrength or reſolution. See Joſh. ii. 9. 24. Prov. xxiv. 10. Iſ. xl. 30, 31. L. xviii. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Gal. vi. 9. Eph. iii. 13. Diſſ. XI. P. II. § 6.

37. *Maunds*, σπυριδας. Ch. xvi. 9, 10. N.

39. *Magdala*, Μαγδαλα. The Vul. *Magedan*; in which it has the concurrence only of the Cam. MS. and of the Sax. verſion.

CHAP. XVI.

1. *To try him*, πειραζοντες. E. T. *Tempting*. For the import of the Gr. word, ſee the note on ch. iv. 7. for there is here no difference in ſignification, between the ſimple πειραζω, and the compound εκπειραζω. An. ſubſtitutes for this word, *with a captious deſign*, and Wor. *captiouſly*. Theſe expreſſions neither give the ſenſe, nor are in the ſpirit, of the Evangeliſt. I admit that it appears from the ſtory, that thoſe men were *captious*. It is certain, however, that the ſacred writer does not call them ſo, but leaves us to collect it from the naked fact. Their putting queſtions to make trial of Jeſus, did not of itſelf imply it; that might have proceeded from the beſt of motives. The hiſtorian invariably preſerves the ſame equable tenor, never betraying the ſmalleſt degree of warmth againſt any perſon, or attempting to prepoſſeſs the minds, or work upon the paſſions, of his readers. There are few miſtakes ſo injurious to the original, as theſe infuſions of a foreign temper.

3. Υποκριται. E. T. *Hypocrites*. But this word is not found in ſome of the moſt valuable MSS. Nor has it been in thoſe copies from which the Vul. ſecond Sy. Arm. Eth. and Sax. verſions were made. Nor was it in the copies uſed by Chr.

9, 10. *Baſkets—maunds*, κοφινους—σπυριδας. E. T. *Baſke'ts—baſkets*. In the relation formerly given of both miracles, and here, where our Lord recapitulates the principal circumſtances of each, the diſtinction of the veſſels employed for holding the fragments is carefully marked. Now, though our words are not fit for anſwering entirely the ſame purpoſe with the original terms, which probably conveyed the idea of their reſpective ſizes, and conſequently of the quantity contained; ſtill there is a propriety in marking, were it but this ſingle circumſtance, that there was a difference. *A maund* is a hand-baſket. It is mentioned by Thevenot*, as uſed in the Eaſt. All the Lat. and foreign tranſlations I have ſeen, ancient and modern, Lu.'s alone excepted, make the diſtinction, though their words are as ill adapted as ours. How it has been overlooked by all the Eng. tranſlators, and, I had almoſt ſaid, by them only, I cannot imagine.

13. *Who do men ſay that the Son of Man is?* E. T. *Whom do men ſay that I the Son of Man am?* Our tranſlators have been generally very attentive to grammatical correctneſs. Here they ſeem to have overlooked it, through attending more to the ſound than to the conſtruction of the words in Gr. and La. Τινα με λεγουσιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι, τον υιον της ανθρωπου; Vul. *Quem dicunt homines eſſe filium hominis?* It muſt be τινα and *quem*, as agreeing with με and *filium hominis* in the accuſative, and connected with the ſubſtantive verb ειναι, and *eſſe* in the infinitive. Thus, we ſhould ſay properly, in Eng. *Whom do they take me to be?* for the very ſame reaſon; *whom* agreeing with *me* in the accuſative, and both ſuiting the verb *to be* in the infinitive. But in any of theſe languages, if the ſentence be ſo conſtrued as that the verb is in the indicative or the ſubjunctive mood, the pronouns muſt be in the nomiſative. We ſay, Who (not whom) is he? for the ſame reaſon that we ſhould ſay. Quis (not quem) eſt hic; or τις (not τινα) εστιν ουτος. I ſhould not have thought this grammatical criticiſm worth making, had I not obſerved that moſt of our tranſlators had, I ſuppoſe, through mere inattention, implicitly followed the manner of the Eng. interpreters.

2. *That the Son of Man is?*—E. T. *That I the Son of Man am?* This is conformable to the common reading. The με, however, was not found in any of the copies uſed by Jerom. The Vul. Ara. Sax. Cop. and Eth.

* Travels, part I. b. II. ch. xxiv.

verſions, have no word correſponding to it. Beſides, it is unſuitable to the ſtyle of the Goſpels. In no other paſſage, where our Lord calls himſelf *the Son of Man*, does he annex the perſonal pronoun, or expreſs himſelf in the firſt perſon, but in the third.

18. *Thou art named Rock; and on this Rock*, συ ει Πετρος, και επι ταυτη τη πετρα— E. T. *Thou art Peter; and upon this rock*— But here the alluſion to the name, though ſpecially intended by our Lord, is totally loſt. There was a neceſſity, therefore, in Eng. in order to do juſtice to the declaration made, to depart a little from the letter. I ſay in Eng. becauſe in ſeveral languages, Lat. Itn. and Fr. for inſtance, as well as in Sy. and Gr. the name, without any change, ſhews the alluſion.

2. *The gates of hades.* Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 17.

19. *Whatever thou ſhalt bind——whatever thou ſhalt loſe*—— Ch. xviii. 18. N.

20. The name *Jeſus* is wanting in many MSS. and ſome ancient verſions.

22. *Taking him aſide*, προσλαβομενος αυτον. E. T. *Took him and*— This expreſſion is quite indefinite. Some render the words, *embraced him;* others, *took him by the hand.* I can diſcover no authority for either. To take aſide evidently ſuits the meaning which the verb has in other places. In Acts xviii. 26. it cannot be interpreted otherwiſe. And even in other parts of that book, where the word is uſed to denote the admiſſion or reception of converts, this ſenſe may be ſaid to be included. An admiſſion into the church was, in ſeveral reſpects, a ſeparation from the world.

2. *Reproved him*, ηρξατο επιτιμαν αυτω. Some interpreters, to put the beſt face on Peter's conduct on this occaſion, render the words thus, *Began to expoſtulate with him.* To tranſlate the verb in this manner, is going juſt as far to an extreme on one hand, as to tranſlate it *threaten* is going on the other. Mr. ix. 25. N. It cannot be queſtioned, that when the verb επιτιμαν relates to any thing paſt, it always implies a declaration of cenſure or blame: and if it be thought that this would infer great preſumption in Peter, it may be aſked, Does not the rebuke which he drew on himſelf, v. 23. from ſo mild a Maſter, evidently infer as much? When we conſider the prejudices of the diſciples, in regard to the nature of the Meſſiah's kingdom, we cannot be much ſurpriſed that a declaration, ſuch as that in v. 21. totally ſubverſive, of all their hopes, ſhould produce, in a warm temper, as great impropriety of behaviour as (admitting the ordinary interpretation of the word) Peter was then chargeable with.

3. *God forbid*, ιλεως σοι. E. T. *Be it far from thee.* In the common uſe of this phraſe in the Sep. it anſwers exactly to a Heb. word ſignifying *abſit, God forbid.* It is thus alſo rendered in the common verſion. See 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 1 Chron. xi. 19. In the Apocrypha the uſe is the ſame. Thus, 1 Mac. ii. 21. ιλεως ημιν καταλιπειν νομον και δικαιωματα, is juſtly rendered in the common verſion, *God forbid that we ſhould forſake the law and the ordinances.* In moſt other places it is tranſlated *far be it.* The ſenſe is the ſame.

23. *Adverſary*, Σατανα. Diſſ. VI. P. I. § 5.

2. *Obſtacle*, σκανδαλον. Ch. v. 29. N.

24. *If any man will come*, ει τις θελει ελθειν. Dod. and others, *If any one is willing to come.* I acknowledge that the Eng. verb *will* does not always reach the full import of the Gr. θελειν: as *will* with us is ſometimes no more than a ſign of the future, it does not neceſſarily ſuggeſt volition. But this example does not fall under the remark. In a caſe like the preſent, if no more than the futurity of the event were regarded, the auxiliary ought to be *ſhall*, and not *will*, as thus, 'If it ſhall be fair 'weather to-morrow, I will go to ſuch a place.' 'If 'he ſhall call on me, I will remind him of his engage-'ment.' In fact, to ſay 'if any man be *willing* to come' is to ſay leſs than 'if any man *will* come.' The former expreſſes only a preſent inclination, the latter a reſolution ſtrong enough to be productive of its effect. But when put in the form of a queſtion, it is equally good either way. L. xiii. 31. N. J. vii. 17. N.

2. *Under my guidance*, οπισω μου. E. T. *After me.* But the Eng. phraſe to come after one, means quite another thing.

26. *With the forfeit of his life*, την δε ψυχην αυτου ζημιωθη. E. T. *Loſe his own ſoul. Forfeit* comes nearer the import of the original word, which Dod. has endeavoured to convey by a circumlocution, *Should be puniſhed with the loſs of his life.* But the chief error lies in changing, without neceſſity, the word anſwering to ψυχη, calling it, in the preceding verſe, *life*, and in this *ſoul.* The expreſſions are proverbial, importing, 'It 'ſignifies nothing how much a man gain, if it be at the 'expence of his life.' That our Lord has a principal eye to the loſs of the ſoul, or of eternal life, there can be no doubt. But this ſentiment is couched under a proverb, which, in familiar uſe, concerns only the preſent life. That ψυχη is ſuſceptible of both meanings is beyond a queſtion.

2. *Not give.* Mr. viii. 37. N.

28. *Shall not taſte death. To taſte death*, and *to ſee death*, are common Hebraiſms for *to die.*

2. *Enter upon his reign;* to wit, by the miraculous diſplays of his power, and the ſucceſs of his doctrine.

CHAP. XVII.

2. *As the light*, ως το φως. Vul. *Sicut nix.* The Cam. ως χιων, The Eth. and Sax. verſions are the only other authorities for this reading.

4. *Booths*, σκηνας. E. T. *Tabernacles.* The word σκηνη denotes not only what we properly call *a tabernacle*, or moveable wooden houſe, and *a tent*, which is

is alſo a portable houſe, conſiſting of either cloth or ſkins, extended on a frame, and eaſily put up or taken down, but alſo a temporary *ſhed* or *booth*, made of the branches of trees, which abounded in the mountainous parts of Judea, where the materials proper for rearing either *tent* or *tabernacle* could not be found on a ſudden. It was of ſuch branches that they reared booths for themſelves on *the feaſt of tabernacles*, which would be more properly ſtyled *the feaſt of booths*, if changing the name of a feſtival did not favour of affectation.

11. *To conſummate the whole*, και αποκαταστησει παντα. E. T. *And reſtore all things*. The original ſenſe of the verb αποκαθιστημι is, *inſtauro, redintegro, I begin anew*. It is moſt properly applied to the ſun and planets, in regard to which the finiſhing and the recommencing of their courſe are coincident. Beſides, their return to the place whence they ſet out does, as it were, reſtore the face of things to what it was at the beginning of their circuit. Hence the word has got two meanings, which, on reflection, are more nearly related than at firſt they appear to be. One is *to reſtore*, the other *to finiſh*. In both ſenſes the word was applicable to the Baptiſt, who came as a reformer to re-eſtabliſh that integrity from which men had departed. He came alſo as the laſt prophet of the old diſpenſation, to finiſh that ſtate of things, and uſher in a new one. When it is followed, as in the text, by ſo comprehenſive word as παντα, without any explanation, it muſt be underſtood in the ſenſe of finiſhing. When the meaning is to reſtore, there never fails to be ſome addition made, to indicate the ſtate to which, or the perſon to whom, the reſtoration is made. See ch. xii. 13. Mr. iii. 5. viii. 25. L. vi. 10. Acts i. 6. Heb. xiii. 19. But when the meaning is to finiſh, no addition is requiſite. In the preſent inſtance, he ſhall reſtore all things, is, to ſay the leaſt, a very indefinite expreſſion. This remark muſt be extended to the verbal noun αποκαταστασις, which, when ſimilarly circumſtanced, ought to be rendered *completion, conſummation*, or *accompliſhment*, not reſtoration, re-eſtabliſhment, or reſtitution. In Acts iii. 21. Peter ſays, concerning our Lord, as it ſtands in the common verſion, *Whom the heaven muſt receive, until the times of reſtitution of all things, which God hath ſpoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, ſince the world began*. To me it is manifeſt, that theſe words, *the reſtitution of all things which God hath ſpoken by his prophets*, convey no meaning at all. Subſtitute *accompliſhment* for *reſtitution*, and there remains not a veſtige either of difficulty, or of impropriety, in the ſentence. I have choſen the verb *to conſummate*, in the preſent inſtance, as it conveys ſomewhat of both the ſenſes of αποκαθιστημι. It denotes, to render perfect, which coincides with the reformation or reſtoration to integrity, he was ſent to promote, and alſo *to conclude*, or finiſh, the Moſaic economy. All the La. and moſt other modern tranſlators, have implicitly followed the Vul. which renders it *reſtituet*. Several Eng. interpreters have varied a little, and given at leaſt a more definite ſenſe, ſome ſaying *regulate all things*, others, *ſet all things right*. But ſome of the Oriental verſions, particularly the Sy. and the Per. render it as I have done.

15. *Lunacy*. This man's diſeaſe we ſhould, from the ſymptoms, call *epilepſy*, rather than *lunacy*. But I did not think it neceſſary to change the name, as the circumſtances mentioned ſufficiently ſhew the caſe, whilſt the appellation given it (σεληνιαζεται) ſhews the general ſentiments at that time, concerning the moon's influence on this ſort of malady.

21. *This kind is not diſpoſſeſſed*. Mr. ix. 29. N.

22. *Is to be delivered up*, μελλει παραδιδοσθαι. In my notion of the import of this compound future, there is much the ſame difference between παραδοθησεται and μελλει παραδιδοσθαι in Gr. as there is between the phraſes *will be delivered* and *is to be delivered* in Eng. The latter gives a hint of the nearneſs of the event, which is not ſuggeſted by the other. Ch. iii. 7. N.

24. *The didrachma;* a tribute exacted for the ſupport of the temple, from which Jeſus, as being the Son of God, whoſe houſe the temple was, ought to have been exempted.

CHAP. XVIII.

3. *Unleſs ye be changed*, εαν μη στραφητε. E. T. *Except ye be converted*. But the Eng. phraſe *to convert*, denotes always one or other of theſe two things, either to bring over from infidelity to the profeſſion of the true religion, or to recover from a ſtate of impenitence to the love and obedience of God. Neither of theſe appears to be the meaning of the word here. The only view is, to ſignify that they muſt lay aſide their ambition and worldly purſuits, before they be honoured to be the members, much more the miniſters, of that new eſtabliſhment, or kingdom, he was about to erect. Caſ. renders it very properly *niſi mutati fueritis*, and has in this been followed by ſome Fr. tranſlators.

6. *An upper millſtone*, μυλος ονικος. E. T. *A millſtone*. All the La. tranſlators have rendered it *mola aſinaria*, a millſtone turned by an aſs. All the foreign tranſlations I have ſeen, adopt this interpretation. That given by Phavorinus appears to me preferable, He explains μυλος ονικος *the upper millſtone*. Ονος alone was a common name for the *upper*, μυλη was for *nether* millſtone. Μυλος might denote either. Sometimes an adjective was joined to ονος, when uſed in this ſenſe, to prevent ambiguity. Xenophon calls ονος αλετης. In the ſame way it appears that Mr. adds to μυλος, *millſtone*, the epithet ονικος, to expreſs the upper. I own that, in the verſion, the laſt mentioned term, after the example of other Eng. tranſlators, might have been dropt, as not affecting the import of the ſentence. But as Mr. has employed a different phraſe, λιθος μυλικος, which expreſſes the thing more generally, I always endeavour, if poſſible, that the Goſpels may not appear, in the tranſlation,

more

more coincident in ſtyle, and manner, than they are, in the original.

7. *Wo unto the world.* L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

10. *Their angels.* It was a common opinion, among the Jews, that every perſon had a guardian angel aſſigned to him.

12. *Will he not leave the ninety nine upon the mountains, and go.* ουχι αφεις τα ενενηκοντα εννεα επι τα ορη πορευθεις. E. T. *Doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains.* Vul. *Nonne relinquit nonaginta novem in montibus, et vadit.* The Sy. to the ſame purpoſe. The Gr. is ſuſceptible of either interpretation, according as we place the comma before, or after, επι τα ορη. The parallel paſſage L. xv. 4. which has no ambiguity, decides the queſtion. What is here called ορη is there ερημος. Both terms ſignify a hilly country, fitter for paſture than for agriculture. Mr. i. 3. N.

17. *Acquaint the congregation with it,* ειπε τη εκκλησια. E. T. *Tell it to the church.* I know no way of reaching the ſenſe of our Lord's inſtructions, but by underſtanding his words ſo as they muſt have been underſtood, by his hearers, from the uſe that then prevailed. The word εκκλησια occurs frequently in the Sep. and is that by which the Heb. קהל *kahal* is commonly tranſlated. That word we find uſed in two different, but related ſenſes, in the O. T. One is for a whole nation, conſidered as conſtituting one commonwealth or polity. In this ſenſe the people of Iſrael are denominated πασα η εκκλησια Ισραηλ, and πασα η εκκλεσια Θεου. The other is for a particular *congregation* or *aſſembly*, either actually convened, or accuſtomed to convene, in the ſame place. In this ſenſe it was applied to thoſe who were wont to aſſemble in any particular ſynagogue; for every ſynagogue had its own εκκλεσια. And as the word συναγωγη was ſometimes employed to ſignify, not the houſe, but the people; thoſe two Gr. words, were often uſed promiſcuouſly. Now as the nature of the thing ſufficiently ſhows that our Lord, in this direction, could not have uſed the word in the firſt of the two ſenſes above given, and required that every private quarrel ſhould be made a national affair, we are under a neceſſity of underſtanding it in the laſt, as regarding the particular congregation to which the parties belonged. What adds great probability to this, as Lightfoot and others have obſerved, is the evidence we have that the like uſage actually obtained in the ſynagogue, and in the primitive church. Whatever foundation, therefore, there may be, from thoſe books of Scripture that concern a later period, for the notion of a church repreſentative; it would be contrary to all the rules of criticiſm, to ſuppoſe that our Lord uſed this term in a ſenſe wherein it could not then be underſtood by any one of his hearers; or that he would ſay *congregation*, for ſo the word literally imports, when he meant only a few heads or directors. L. Cl. renders this paſſage in the ſame manner, *dites le a l'aſſemblé.* But in ch. xvi. 18. where our Lord manifeſtly ſpeaks of all, without exception, who, to the end of the world, ſhould receive him as the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God, I have retained the word *church*, as being there perfectly unequivocal.

18. *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind,* οσα εαν δησητε. The promiſe made eſpecially to Peter, ch. xvi. 19. is made here to every Chriſtian community. The Jewiſh phraſeology ſeems to warrant the explanation of *binding* and *looſing*, by *prohibiting* and *permitting*. The connection here would more naturally lead us to interpret it, of *condemning* and *abſolving*, thus making it a figurative expreſſion of what is ſpoken plainly, J. xx. 23. *Whoſe ſins ſoever ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whoſe ſins ſoever ye retain, they are retained.* It is not impoſſible that, under the figure of *binding and looſing*, both may be comprehended. It is a good rule, in doubtful caſes, to tranſlate literally, though obſcurely, rather than run the hazard of miſtranſlating, by confining an expreſſion to a meaning of which we are doubtful whether it was the author's.

23. *The adminiſtration of heaven,* η βασιλεια των ουρανων. Diſſ. V. P. I. § 7.

25. *That he, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, ſhould be ſold.* A cuſtom, for the ſatisfaction of creditors, which, how cruel ſoever we juſtly account it, was, in early ages, eſtabliſhed by the laws of many countries, in Europe, as well as in Aſia, republican, as well as monarchical.

29. *I will pay thee.* The common Gr. adds παντα, *all.* But this word is not found in many MSS. ſeveral of them of principal note, nor in ſome ancient verſions and editions. Mill and Wetſtein have both thought proper to reject it.

34. *To the jailors,* τοις βασανισαις. E. T. *To the tormentors.* The word βασανιστης properly denotes *examiner*, particularly one who has it in charge to *examine by torture.* Hence it came to ſignify *jailor*, for on ſuch, in theſe days, was this charge commonly devolved. They were not only allowed, but even commanded, to treat the wretches in their cuſtody, with every kind of cruelty, in order to extort payment from them, in caſe they had concealed any of their effects; or, if they had had nothing, to wreſt the ſum owed, from the compaſſion of their relations and friends, who, to releaſe an unhappy perſon, for whom they had a regard, from ſuch extreme miſery, might be induced to pay the debt; for, let it be obſerved, that the perſon of the inſolvent debtor was abſolutely in the power of the creditor, and at his diſpoſal.

35. *Who forgiveth not from his heart the faults of his brother,* εαν μη αφητε εκαστος τω αδελφω αυτου απο των καρδιων υμων τα παραπτωματα αυτων. There is nothing in the Vul, anſwering to the three laſt words. The ſame may be ſaid of the Ara. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. verſions.

verſions. They are wanting alſo in the Cam. and three other MSS.

CHAP. XIX.

1. *Upon the Jordan.* Ch. iv. 15. N.

4. *When the Creator made man, he formed a male and a female,* ὁ ποιησας αρσεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτας. E. T. *He which made them, made them male and female.* But they could not have tranſlated the clauſe differently, if the Gr. expreſſion had been αρσενας και θηλειας εποιησεν αυτας. Yet it is manifeſt that the ſenſe would have been different. All that this declaration would have implied is, that when God created mankind, he made people of both ſexes. But what argument could have been drawn from this principle to ſhew that the tie of marriage was indiſſoluble? Or how could the concluſion annexed have been ſupported? *For this cauſe a man ſhall leave father and mother*—Beſides, it was ſurely unneceſſary to recur to the hiſtory of the creation, to convince thoſe Phariſees of what all the world knew, that the human race was compoſed of men and women, and conſequently, of two ſexes. The weight of the argument, therefore, muſt lie in this circumſtance, that God created at firſt no more than a ſingle pair, one of each ſex, whom he united in the bond of marriage, and, in ſo doing, exhibited a ſtandard of that union to all generations. The very words, *and theſe two,* ſhew that it is implied in the hiſtorian's declaration, that they were two, one male and one female, and no more. But this is by no means implied in the common verſion. It lets us know, indeed, that there were two ſexes, but gives us no hint that theſe were but two perſons. Unluckily, Eng. adjectives have no diſtinction of number; and through this imperfection, there appears here, in all the Eng. tranſlations I have ſeen, ſomething inconcluſive in the reaſoning, which is peculiar to them. In our idiom, an adjective, conſtrued with the pronoun *them,* or indeed with any plural noun or pronoun, is underſtood to be plural. There is, therefore, a neceſſity, in a caſe like this, if we would do juſtice to the original, that the defect, occaſioned by our want of inflections, be ſupplied, by giving the ſentence ſuch a turn as will fully expreſs the ſenſe. This end is here eaſily effected, as the words *male* and *female,* in our language, may be uſed either adjectively or ſubſtantively. And when they are uſed as ſubſtantives, they are ſuſceptible of the diſtinction of number.

5. *They two ſhall be one fleſh,* εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν. This is a quotation from Gen. ii. 24. in which place it deſerves our notice, that there is no word anſwering to *two* in the preſent Maſoretic editions of the Heb. Bible. But, on the other hand, it ought to be obſerved that the Samaritan copies have this word, that the Sep. reads exactly as the Goſpel does. So do alſo the Vul. the Sy. and the Ara. verſions of the O. T. It has been obſerved of this paſſage, that it is four times quoted in the N. T. to wit, here, in Mr. x. 8. 1 Cor. vi. 16. and Eph. v. 31. and in none of them is the word *δυο* wanting. The only ancient verſion, of any conſideration, wherein it is not found, is the Chaldee. But with regard to it, we ought to remember, that as the Jewiſh Rabbies have made greater uſe of it, in their ſynagogues and ſchools, than of any other verſion, they have had it in their power to reduce it, and in fact have reduced it, to a much cloſer conformity, than any other, to the Heb. of the Maſorets. It is well known how implicitly the Rabbies are followed by their people. And they could not have adopted a more plauſible rule than that the tranſlation ought to be corrected by the original. But as there can be no doubt about the authenticity of the reading in the N. T. I think, for the reaſons above named, there is the greateſt ground to believe, that the ancient reading in the O. T. was the ſame with this of the New.

7. *Why did Moſes command to give a writing of divorcement, and diſmiſs her?* By the manner in which they put the queſtion, one would imagine that Moſes had commanded both, to wit, the diſmiſſion and the writing of divorcement; whereas, in fact, he had only permitted the diſmiſſion; but, in caſe they ſhould uſe the permiſſion given them, commanded the writing of divorcement.

8. *Untractable diſpoſition.* σκληροκαρδιαν. Diſſ. IV. § 22.

12. *Let him act this part who can act it,* ὁ δυναμενος χωρειν, χωρειτω. E. T. *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* This expreſſion is rather dark and indefinite. Χωρειν, amongſt other things, ſignifies, *to receive, to admit, to be capable of.* It is applied equally to things ſpeculative, and, in that caſe, denotes, *to underſtand, to comprehend;* and to things practical, in which caſe it denotes, *to reſolve,* and *to execute.* Every body muſt perceive that the reference here is to the latter of theſe.

13. *Lay his hands upon them and pray.* It appears to have been cuſtomary among the Jews, when one prayed for another who was preſent, to lay his hand upon the perſon's head.

17. *Why calleſt thou me good?* Τι με λεγεις αγαθον, Vul. *Quid me interrogas de bono?* Five MSS. read, in conformity to the Vul. Τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου, With this agree alſo the Cop. the Arm. the Sax. and the Eth. verſions. This reading is likewiſe approved by Origen, and ſome other ancients after him, and alſo by ſome moderns, amongſt whom are Er. Gro. Mill, and Ben. The other reading is, nevertheleſs, in my opinion, preferable, on more accounts than one. Its evidence, from MSS. is beyond compariſon ſuperior; the verſions on both ſides may nearly balance each other; but the internal evidence ariſing from the ſimplicity and connection of the thoughts, is entirely in

favour of the common reading. Nothing can be more pertinent than to ſay, 'If you believe that God 'alone is good, why do you call me ſo?' whereas nothing can appear leſs pertinent than, 'If you believe that God 'alone is good, why do you conſult me concerning the 'good that you muſt do?'

23. *It is difficult for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.* By *the kingdom of heaven* is ſometimes underſtood in this hiſtory, the Chriſtian church, then ſoon to be erected, and ſometimes the ſtate of the bleſt in heaven, after the reſurrection. In regard to this declaration of our Lord, I take it to hold true, in which way ſoever the kingdom be underſtood. When it was only by means of perſuaſion that men were brought into a ſociety, hated and perſecuted by all the ruling powers of the earth, Jewiſh and Pagan; we may reſt aſſured that the opulent and the voluptuous (characters which, in a diſſolute age, commonly go together), who had ſo much to loſe, and ſo much to fear, would not, among the hearers of the Goſpel, be the moſt eaſily perſuaded. The Apoſtle James, ii. 5, 6. accordingly atteſts this to have been the fact; it was *the poor in this world whom God had choſen rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom;* whereas, they were *the rich in this world who oppreſſed them, dragged them before their tribunals, and blaſphemed that worthy name by which they were called.* As little can there be any doubt of the juſtneſs of the ſentiment, in relation to the ſtate of the bleſſed hereafter, when the deceitfulneſs of riches, and the ſnare into which it ſo often inveigles men, are duly conſidered. So cloſe an analogy runs through all the divine diſpenſations, that, in more inſtances than this, it may be affirmed with truth, that the declarations of Scripture are ſuſceptible of either interpretation.

24. *A camel.* καμηλον. The. obſerves, that ſome explain the word as ſignifying here *a cable.* A good authority, however, for this ſignification, though adopted by Caſ. who ſays, *rudentem*, I have never ſeen. The frequency of the term, amongſt all ſorts of writers, for denoting the beaſt ſo denominated is undeniable. Beſides, *the camel*, being the largeſt animal they were acquainted with in Judea, its name was become proverbial for denoting any thing remarkably large, and *a camel's paſſing through a needle's eye*, came, by conſequence, as appears from ſome rabbinical writings, to expreſs a thing abſolutely impoſſible.

To paſs through the eye of a needle, δια τρυπηματος ραφιδος διελθειν. A great number of MSS. ſome of the moſt valuable, though neither the Al. nor the Cam. inſtead of διελθειν read εισελθειν. Agreeable to this are both the Sy. the Cop. Eth. and Ara. verſions. The Vul. and other verſions follow the common reading. Should the external evidence appear balanced on both ſides, the common reading is preferable, as yielding a better ſenſe. Paſſing through a needle's eye is the circumſtance in which the impoſſibility lies. There was no occaſion for ſuggeſting whither. There is even ſomething odd in the ſuggeſtion, which is very unlike the manner of this author. Wet. adopts the alteration.

28. *That, at the renovation, when the Son of Man ſhall be ſeated on his glorious throne, ye, my followers, ſitting alſo upon twelve thrones, ſhall judge,* ότι ὑμεις οι ακολουθησαντες μοι, εν τη παλιγγενεσια όταν καθιση ὁ υἱος του ανθρωπου επι θρονου δοξης αυτου, καθισεσθε και ὑμεις επι δωδεκα θρονους, κρινοντες. E. T. *Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man ſhall ſit in the throne of his glory, ye alſo ſhall ſit upon twelve thrones, judging.* In regard to which verſion, two things occur to be obſerved; 1ſt, That εν τη παλιγγενεσια (in which there is an ambiguity, as was remarked in Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 22.) is rendered, as though it belonged to the preceding clauſe, ακολουθησαντες μοι, whereas the ſcope of the paſſage requires, that it be conſtrued with the clauſe which follows it. 2dly, That the word παλιγγενεσια is, in this place, better tranſlated *renovation.* We are accuſtomed to apply the term *regeneration* ſolely to the converſion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general ſtate of things. As they were wont to denominate *the creation* γενεσις, a remarkable reſtoration, or *renovation*, of the face of things, was very ſuitably termed παλιγγενεσια. The return of the Iſraelites to their own land, after the Babyloniſh captivity, is ſo named by Joſephus, the Jewiſh hiſtorian. What was ſaid on verſe 23. holds equally in regard to the promiſe we have here. The principal completion will be at the general reſurrection, when there will be, in the moſt important ſenſe, *a renovation*, or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when all things ſhall become new; yet, in a ſubordinate ſenſe, it may be ſaid to have been accompliſhed when God came to viſit, in judgment, that guilty land; when the old diſpenſation was utterly aboliſhed, and ſucceeded by the Chriſtian diſpenſation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted.

CHAP. XX.

1. This chapter, in the original, begins, Ὁμοια γαρ. The γαρ ſhows manifeſtly that what follows was ſpoken in illuſtration of the ſentence with which the preceding chapter concludes, and which, therefore, ought not to have been disjoined from this parable. The Vul. has no particle anſwering to γαρ. In that verſion the chapter begins thus, *Simile eſt regnum cœlorum.* But this does not ſeem to have ſprung from a different reading, as there is no diverſity here in the Gr. MSS. nor, for aught I can learn, in ancient tranſlations. I rather think that the omiſſion has happened after the diviſion into chapters, and has ariſen from a notion of the impropriety of beginning a chapter with the caſual particle. It adds to the probability of this, that ſeveral old La. MSS. have the conjunction as well as the Gr.

a. *The adminiſtration.* Diſſ. V. P. I. § 7.

13. *Friend*

13. *Friend*, ἑταιρε. Diff. XII. P. I. § 11.

15. *May not I do what I will with mine own?* ουκ εξεστι μοι ποιησαι ὁ θελω εν τοις εμοις; Vul. *Non licet mihi quod volo facere?* Here there is no tranſlation of the words εν τοις εμοις, though of manifeſt importance to the ſenſe. There is the ſame defect in the Sax. and Arm. verſions, but in them any Gr. MS. that has yet appeared, nor in any other tranſlation.

22. *Undergo an immerſion like that which I muſt undergo*, το βαπτισμα ὁ εγω βαπτιζομαι, βαπτισθηναι. E. T. *To be baptiſed with the baptiſm that I am baptiſed with.* The primitive ſignification of βαπτισμα is *immerſion*, of βαπτιζειν, *to immerſe, plunge*, or *overwhelm*. The noun ought never to be rendered *baptiſm*, nor the verb *to baptize*, but when employed in relation to a religious ceremony. The verb βαπτιζειν ſometimes, and βαπτειν, which is ſynonymous, often, occurs in the Sep. and Apocryphal writings, and is always rendered in the common verſion by one or other of theſe words, *to dip, to waſh, to plunge*. When the original expreſſion, therefore, is rendered in familiar language, there appears nothing harſh or extraordinary in the metaphor. Phraſes like theſe, to be overwhelmed with grief, to be immerſed in affliction, will be found common in moſt languages.

It is proper here farther to obſerve, that the whole of this clauſe, and that correſponding to it, in the ſubſequent verſe, are in this Goſpel wanting in the Vul. and ſeveral MSS. As they are found, however, in the far greater number both of ancient verſions, and of MSS. and perfectly coincide with the ſcope of the paſſage, I did not think there was weight enough in what might be urged, on the oppoſite ſide, to warrant the omiſſion of them; neither indeed does Wet. But Gro. and Mill are of the contrary opinion.

23. *I cannot give, unleſs to thoſe*, ουκ εστιν εμον δουναι αλλ' οις. E. T. *Is not mine to give; but it ſhall be given to them.* The conjunction αλλα, when, as in this place, it is not followed by a verb, but by a noun or pronoun, is generally to be underſtood as of the ſame import with ει μη *niſi, unleſs, except*. Otherwiſe, the verb muſt be ſupplied, as is done here, in the common verſion. But as ſuch an ellipſis is uncommon, recourſe ought not to be had without neceſſity. Of the interpretation I have given of the conjunction αλλα, we have an example, Mr. ix. 8. compared with Mt. xvii. 8

26. *Servant*, διακονος. E. T. *Miniſter.*
28. *Slave*, δουλος. E. T. *Servant.*
} In the proper and primitive ſenſe of διακονος, it is a *ſervant* who attends his maſter, waits on him at table, and is always near his perſon, to obey his orders, which was accounted a more creditable kind of ſervice. By the word δουλος is not only meant *a ſervant* in general (whatever kind of work he be employed in), but alſo *a ſlave*. It is ſolely from the ſcope and connection that we muſt judge, when it ſhould be rendered in the one way, and when in the other. In the paſſage before us, the view in both verſes is to ſignify, that the true dignity of the Chriſtian will ariſe more from the ſervice he does to others, than the power he poſſeſſes over them. We are to judge, therefore, of the value of the words from the import o thoſe they are contraſted with. And as deſiring to be *great* is a more moderate ambition than deſiring to be *chief*, we naturally conclude, that as the word oppoſed to the former ſhould be expreſſive of ſome of the inferior ſtations in life, that oppoſed to the latter muſt be expreſſive of the loweſt. When this ſufficiently ſuits the ordinary ſignification of the words, there can hardly remain any doubt. As this is manifeſtly the caſe here, I did not know any words in our language by which I could better expreſs a difference in degree, ſo clearly intended, than the words *ſervant* and *ſlave*. The word *miniſter* is now appropriated to the ſervants, not of private maſters, but of the public. It is from the diſtinctions in private life, well known at the time, that our Lord's illuſtrations are borrowed.

31. *Charged them to be ſilent*, επετιμησεν αυτοις ινα σιωπησωσιν. E. T. *Rebuked them, becauſe they ſhould hold their peace.* The hiſtorian ſurely did not mean to blame the poor men for their importunity. Our Lord, on the contrary, commends ſuch importunity, ſometimes expreſsly in words, and always by making the application ſucceſsful. But to render ινα *becauſe*, appears quite unexampled. It anſwers commonly to the La. *ut*, ſometimes to *ita ut*, but never, as far as I remember, to *quia*. It is rendered *ut* in this paſſage in all the La. verſions. The import of ινα aſcertains the ſenſe of επιτιμαω, which is frequently tranſlated *to charge*, even in the common verſion. In proof of this, ſeveral places might be produced; but I ſhall only refer the reader to the parallel paſſage in Mr. x. 48. where επετιμων αυτω πολλοι ινα σιωπηση is tranſlated *Many charged him that he ſhould hold his peace;* and to Mr. ix. 25. N.

CHAP. XXI.

4. *Now all this was done, that the words of the prophet might be fulfilled*, τουτο δε ὁλον γεγονεν, ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου. Our Lord's perfect knowledge of all that the prophets had predicted concerning him, gives a propriety to this manner of rendering theſe words, when every thing is done by his direction, which they cannot have in any other circumſtances.

5. *The daughter of Zion*, that is, *Jeruſalem*, ſo named from Mount Zion, which was in the city, and on which was erected a fortreſs for its defence. This poetical manner of perſonifying the cities and countries, to which they addreſſed themſelves, was familiar to the prophets.

2. From the other Evangeliſts it would appear, that our Lord rode only on the colt; from this paſſage, we ſhould be apt to think that both had been uſed. But it is not unuſual with the ſacred authors, when either the nature of the thing ſpoken of, or the attendant circum-

circumſtances, are ſufficient for precluding miſtakes, to employ the plural number for the ſingular.

7. *Covering them with their mantles,* επεθηκαν επανω αυτων τα ἱματια αυτων. The Sy. interpreter, either from a different reading in the copies he uſed, or (which is more likely) from a deſire to expreſs the ſenſe more clearly, has rendered it *they laid their mantles on the colt.*

9. *Bleſſed be he that cometh,* ευλογημενος ὁ ερχομενος. E. T. *Bleſſed is he that cometh.* But acclamations of this kind are always of the nature of prayers, or ardent wiſhes; like the Fr. *vive le roi,* or our *God ſave the king.* Nay, the words connected are entirely of this character. *Hoſanna to the Son of David,* is equivalent to *God preſerve the Son of David;* and conſequently what follows is the ſame as *proſperous be the reign of him that cometh in the name of the Lord.*

12. *The temple,* το ἱερον. Let it be obſerved that the word here is not ναος. By the latter, was meant properly *the houſe,* including only the veſtibule, the holy place or ſanctuary, and the moſt holy. Whereas, the former comprehended all the courts. It was in the outermoſt court that this ſort of traffic was exerciſed. For want of a name in European languages peculiar to each, theſe two are confounded in moſt modern tranſlations. To the ναος, or temple, ſtrictly ſo called, none of thoſe people had acceſs, not even our Lord himſelf, becauſe not of the poſterity of Aaron. L. i. 9. N.

13. *Of robbers,* λῃσων. E. T. *Of thieves.* Diſſ. XI. P. II. § 6.

25. *Whence had John authority to baptiſe?* το βαπτισμα Ιωαννη ποθεν ην; E. T. *The baptiſm of John, whence was it?* But a man's baptiſm means, with us, ſolely his partaking of that ordinance; whereas this queſtion relates, not to John's receiving baptiſm, but to his right to enjoin and confer baptiſm. The queſtion, as it ſtands in the common verſion, conveys, to the unlearned reader, a ſenſe totally different from the author's. It ſounds, as though it had been put, 'Was John baptiſed by an 'angel, ſent from heaven on purpoſe, or by an or'dinary man?' In all ſuch caſes, if one would neither be unintelligible, nor expreſs a falſe meaning, one muſt not attempt to trace the words of the original. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 14.

31. *The firſt,* ὁ πρωτος. In the old Itc. it was *noviſſimus.* The Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. read in the ſame manner. In the Cam. and two other Gr. MSS. it is ὁ εσχατος. This is one of thoſe readings which it would require more than ordinary external evidence to authoriſe.

32. *In the way of ſanctity,* εν ὁδω δικαιοσυνης. E. T. *In the way of righteouſneſs.* This is one proof among many of the various ſignifications given to the word δικαιοσυνη in the N. T. There can be no doubt that this is ſpoken principally in alluſion to the authorities of John's manner of living in the deſert, in reſpect of food, raiment, and lodging. The word *ſanctity,* in our language, though not quite ſo common, ſuits the meaning here better than *righteouſneſs.*

33. *Went abroad,* απεδημησεν. E. T. *Went into a far country.* This is an exact tranſlation of what is ſaid of the prodigal, L. xv. 13. απεδημησεν εις χωραν μακραν, but not of what is ſaid here. The word απεδημησεν implies barely that it was a foreign country he went to; nothing is added to inform us whether it was *far* or *near.*

35. *Drove away with ſtones another,* ὁν δε ελιθοβολησαν. E. T. *Stoned another.* But λιθοβολειν does not always denote to kill by ſtoning, as the Eng. word *ſtoned* ſeems to imply. That it does not ſignify ſo in this place, is evident from the diſtinction made in the treatment given, ὁν δε απεκτειναν.

41. *He will put thoſe wretches to a wretched death,* κακους κακως απολεσει αυτους. E. T. *He will miſerably deſtroy thoſe wicked men.* This idiom is entirely Grecian. Lucian ſays, κακοι κακως απολυνται, *Icaromenippus.* Several other examples have been produced by Sc. and Wa. I have been lucky enough here to expreſs the meaning, without loſing the paronomaſia, which is not without its emphaſis. *Wretches* and *wretched,* like κακους and κακως, are equally ſuſceptible of both ſignifications, *wicked* and *miſerable.* It is not poſſible always, in tranſlating, to convey both the ſenſe and the trope. And when both cannot be done, no reaſonable perſon will be at a loſs which to prefer.

43. *Know therefore.* This is one of the cleareſt predictions of the rejection of the Jews, and of the call of the Gentiles, which we have in this hiſtory.

CHAP. XXII.

14. *For there are many called, but few choſen,* πολλοι γαρ εισι κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι. E. T. *For many are called, but few are choſen.* The difference in theſe two ways of rendering is, to appearance, inconſiderable, but it is real. Let it be obſerved, that the Gr. words κλητοι and εκλεκτοι are merely adjectives; *called* and *choſen,* in the E. T. can be underſtood no otherwiſe than as participles, inſomuch that, if we were to turn the Eng. into Gr. we ſhould uſe neither of thoſe words, but ſay, πολλοι γαρ εισι κεκλημενοι, ολιγοι δε εκλελεγμενοι, which does not perfectly coincide in meaning with the expreſſion of the Evangeliſt. I acknowledge, it is impoſſible to mark the difference, with equal preciſion, in any language, which has only one term for both uſes. The diſtinction with us is ſimilar, and nowiſe inferior to that which is found between Olivetan's, and more modern Fr. verſions. The former ſays, *Pluſieurs ſont appellés, mais peu ſont elus;* the latter, *Il y a beaucoup d'appellés, mais peu d'elus.*

16. *Herodians.* Probably partizans of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee; thoſe who were for the continuance of the royal power in the deſcendants of Herod the Great. This was an object which, it appears, the greater part of the nation, eſpecially the Phariſees, did not favour. They conſidered that family, not indeed as idolaters, but as great conformiſts to the idolatrous cuſtoms of both Greeks and Romans, whoſe favour they ſpared no pains to ſecure. The notion, adopted by by ſome, that the Herodians were thoſe who believed Herod to be the Meſſiah, hardly deſerves to be mentioned, as there is no evidence that ſuch an opinion was maintained by any body.

18. *Malice,* πονηριαν. Ch. xxv. 26. N.

Diſſemblers, υποκριται. E. T. *Hypocrites.* Diſſ. III. § 24.

19. *A denarius.* Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 4.

23. *Who ſay that there is no future life,* οι λεγοντες μη ειναι αναστασιν. E. T. *Which ſay that there is no reſurrection.* The word αναστασις, or rather the phraſe, αναστασις των νεκρων, is indeed the common term, by which *the reſurrection,* properly ſo called, is denominated in the N. T. Yet this is neither the only, nor the primitive, import of the word αναστασις. It denotes ſimply, being raiſed from inactivity to action, or from obſcurity to eminence, or a return to ſuch a ſtate, after an interruption. The verb ανιστημι has the like latitude of ſignification; and both words are uſed in this extent by the writers of the N. T. as well as by the Seventy. Agreeably therefore to the original import, *riſing* from a ſeat is properly termed αναστασις, ſo is *awaking* out of ſleep, or *promotion* from an inferior condition. The word occurs in this laſt ſenſe, L. ii. 34. In this view, when applied to the dead, the word denotes, properly, no more than a *renewal of life* to them, in whatever manner this happen. Nay, that the Phariſees themſelves did not univerſally mean, by this term, the re-union of ſoul and body, is evident from the account which the Jewiſh hiſtorian gives of their doctrine, as well as from ſome paſſages in the Goſpels; of both which I had occaſion to take notice in Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 19. To ſay, therefore, in Eng. in giving the tenets of the Sadducees, that *they deny the reſurrection,* is, at leaſt, to give a very defective account of their ſentiments on this very topic. It is notorious, not only from Joſephus, and other Jewiſh writers, but from what is ſaid, Acts xxiii. 8. that they denied the exiſtence of angels, and all ſeparate ſpirits. In this, they went much farther than the Pagans, who did indeed deny what Chriſtians call *the reſurrection of the body,* but acknowledged a ſtate after death, wherein the ſouls of the departed exiſt, and receive the reward, or the puniſhment, of the actions done upon the earth. But not only is the verſion here given a juſter repreſentation of the Sadducean hypotheſis, at the ſame time that it is entirely conformable to the ſenſe of the word, but it is the only verſion which makes our Lord's argument appear pertinent, and levelled againſt the doctrine he wanted to refute. In the common verſion, they are ſaid to deny the reſurrection, that is, that the ſoul and the body ſhall hereafter be reunited; and our Lord brings an argument from the Pentateuch to prove——What? not that they ſhall be reunited (to this it has not even the moſt diſtant relation), but that the ſoul ſurvives the body, and ſubſiſts after the body is diſſolved. This many would have admitted, who denied the reſurrection. Yet ſo evidently did it ſtrike at the root of the ſcheme of the Sadducees, that they were ſilenced by it, and, to the conviction of the hearers, confuted. Now this, I will take upon me to ſay, could not have happened, if the fundamental error of the Sadducees had been, barely, the denial of the reſurrection of the body, and not the denial of the immortality of the ſoul, or rather of its actual ſubſiſtence after death, for I ſpeak not here of what ſome call the natural immortality of the ſoul. It poſſible, the words in L. xx. 38. παντες αυτω ζωσιν, make it ſtill more evident, that our Lord conſidered this as all that was incumbent on one who would confute the Sadducees, to prove, namely, that the ſoul ſtill continued to live after the perſon's natural death. Now, if this was the ſubverſion of Sadduceiſm, Sadduceiſm muſt have conſiſted in denying that the ſoul continues to live, ſeparated from the body, or, which is nearly the ſame, in affirming, that the diſſolution of the union is the deſtruction of the living principle. It may be objected, that, in v. 28. there is a clear reference to what is ſpecially called *the reſurrection,* which, by the way, is ſtill clearer from the manner wherein it is expreſſed, Mr. xii. 23. εν τη ουν αναστασει, οταν αναστωσι. This mode of expreſſion, ſo like a tautology, appears, to me, to have been adopted by that Evangeliſt, on purpoſe to ſhow, that he uſed the αναστασις here, in a more confined ſenſe than he had done in the preceding part of the ſtory. The Sadducee, as is common with diſputants, thinks it ſufficient, for ſupporting his own doctrine, to ſhow ſome abſurdity in that of his antagoniſt. And he conſiders it as furniſhing him with a better handle for doing this, to introduce upon the ſcene, the woman, and the ſeven claimants, all at once, who are no ſooner raiſed than they engage in conteſts about their property in her. But this is no reaſon why we ſhould not interpret our Lord's words, and the words of the hiſtorian, relating to the opinions of the ſect, in all the latitude which the nature of the ſubject, and the context, evidently ſhow to belong to them. The only modern verſion I have ſeen, wherein αναστασις is rendered *future life,* is the Eng. An.

24. *Leave no children,* μη εχων τεκνα. Vul. *Non habens filium.* It may be doubted whether this verſion has proceeded from a different reading, as it is quite unſupported, either by MSS. or by other tranſlations. But it agrees exactly with the Heb. in the paſſage of Deut. xxv. 5. referred to. The words are there אין לו בן. The ſenſe is the ſame in both, as in ſeveral inſtances the Heb. *ben* is uſed for a child indefi-

nitely, whatever be the ſex. In the place quoted, the words are rendered in the Vul. *abſque liberis*, and in the E. T. *have no child*.

32. *God is not a God of the dead*, ουκ εστιν ὁ Θεος, Θεος νεκρων. Vul. *Non eſt Deus mortuorum*. The Sy. Sax. and Cop. agree with the Vul. in uſing no word anſwering to the firſt ὁ Θεος, which is alſo omitted in the Cam. Dr Prieſtley ſays [Harmony, ſect. lxxii.], "This argu-"ment of our Saviour's evidently goes on the ſuppoſi-"tion of there being no intermediate ſtate." Now, to me, it is evident, that the direct ſcope of the argument is to prove, that there is ſuch a ſtate, or, at leaſt, that the ſoul ſurvives the body, and is capable of enjoyment after the natural death. The reaſon which the Doctor has ſubjoined, is, if poſſible, more wonderful ſtill. "For "admitting," ſays he, "this [intermediate ſtate], God "might, with the ſtricteſt propriety, be ſaid to be the "God of thoſe patriarchs, as they were then living, "and happy, though their bodies were in the grave." Is it then a maxim with this learned gentleman, that nothing can be admitted which would ſhow the words to be ſtrictly proper, and the reaſoning concluſive? So it appears; for, in perfect conſiſtency with this maxim, he concludes his explanation (if I may call it ſo) with theſe remarkable words: "There does not, however, ſeem to "be much force in the argument, except with the Jews, "to whom it was addreſſed, and who admitted ſimilar "conſtructions of Scripture. For though Abraham, "Iſaac, and Jacob, were periſhed, the perſon who ſpake "to Moſes might make himſelf known to him, as he "whom they had worſhipped." If ſo, this critic ſhould have ſaid, not that there was not much force, but that there was no force at all, in the argument. The whole then of this memorable confutation, according to him, amounts to no more than an argument *ad hominem*, as logicians term it, that is, a fallacious argument, which really proves nothing, and is adopted ſolely, becauſe the medium, though falſe, is admitted by the antago-niſt, who is therefore not qualified to detect the fallacy. But unluckily, in the preſent caſe, if the argument be inconcluſive, it has not even that poor advantage of being an argument *ad hominem*. The Doctor ſhould have remembered that our Lord, in this inſtance, was diſputing with Sadducees, who paid no regard to the traditionary interpretations, and myſtical conſtruc-tions, of Scripture, admitted by the Phariſees. Yet even theſe Sadducees were put to ſilence by it. The truth is, our Lord's argument ſtands in no need of ſuch a lame apology, as that it is an argument *ad hominem*. Conſider it as it lies, without the aid of artificial com-ments, and it will be found evidently deciſive of the great point in diſpute with the Sadducees, whether the ſoul periſhed with the body. 'God,' ſays our Lord, 'when he appeared to Moſes in the buſh, which was 'long after the death of the Patriarchs, ſaid to him, *I 'am the God of Abraham, and of Iſaac, and of Jacob; 'now God is not a God of the dead*, of thoſe who, being 'deſtitute of life, and conſequently of ſenſibility, can 'neither know nor honour him; he is the God of thoſe 'only who love and adore him, and are, by conſe-'quence, alive.' Theſe Patriarchs, therefore, though dead in reſpect of us, who enjoy their preſence here no longer, are alive in reſpect of God, whom they ſtill ſerve and worſhip. However true then it may be, as the Doctor remarks, that "though Abraham, Iſaac, "and Jacob, were periſhed, the perſon who ſpoke to "Moſes might make himſelf known to him, as he "whom they had worſhipped," this remark does not ſuit the preſent caſe; nor could the words of God, on that ſuppoſition, have been the ſame with thoſe which we find recorded by the ſacred penman. For God, as in the paſſage quoted, made himſelf known to Moſes, not as he whom the Patriarchs had worſhipped, but expreſsly as he whom they then worſhipped; for he ſays not, I *was* the God of Abraham, and of Iſaac, and of Jacob, to wit, when the Patriarchs lived upon the earth, but, I *am* their God at preſent. It is mani-feſtly from this particularity in the expreſſion, which cannot, without ſtraining, be adapted, either to the paſt or to the future, that Jeſus concludes they were then living. Nor let it be thought too ſlight a circumſtance for an argument of this importance to reſt upon. The argument is, in effect, founded, as all reaſoning from revelation, in the veracity of God; but the import of what God ſays, as related in Scripture, we muſt, not in this inſtance only, but in every inſtance, infer from the ordinary conſtruction and idioms of language. When the Creator, in treating with his creatures, con-deſcends to employ their ſpeech; as his end is to in-form, and not to deceive, his words muſt be interpreted by the common rules of ſpeaking, in the ſame way wherein we ſhould interpret what is ſaid by any of our fellow-creatures. Now, if we ſhould overhear one man ſay to another, 'I wiſh to have you in my ſervice, and 'to be your maſter, as I am your father's, and your 'grandfather's, maſter;' ſhould we not conclude that the perſons ſpoken of are alive, and his ſervants, at this very moment? And would it not be reaſonable to in-ſiſt that, if they were dead, his expreſſion would be, 'As I was your father's, and your grandfather's maſ-'ter?' This is, in effect, the explanation given of the reaſoning in this paſſage, by the moſt ancient Gr. ex-poſitors, Chr. Euth. and The. I know it is urged, on the other ſide, that though the verb ειμι is uſed in the Gr. of the Evangeliſt, and in the Sep. there is nothing which anſwers to it in the Heb. and conſequently, the words of Moſes might as well have been rendered *I was*, as *I am*. But this conſequence is not juſt. The Heb. has no preſent of the indicative. This want, in active verbs, is ſupplied by the participle; in the ſubſtantive verb, by the juxtapoſition of the terms to which that verb in other languages ſerves as the copula. The ab-ſence of the verb, therefore, is as much evidence in Heb. that what is affirmed or denied, is meant of the preſent time as the form of the tenſe is in Gr. or La. Where-ever either the paſt or the future is intended by the ſpeak-er, as the Orientals are not deficient in theſe tenſes, the verb is not left to be ſupplied by the hearer. Thus God ſays to Joſhua (ch. i. 5.), *As I was with Moſes*,

Moſes, that is, when he was employed in conducting the ſons of Iſrael in the wilderneſs, *ſo will I be with thee.* The verb is expreſſed in both clauſes. See alſo v. 17. and 1 Ki. viii. 57. All which examples are, except in the ſingle circumſtance of time, perfectly ſimilar to this of the Evangeliſt; and are ſufficient evidence that, where the ſubſtantive verb is not expreſſed, but the perſonal pronoun is immediately conjoined with what is affirmed, the ſenſe muſt, in other languages, be exhibited by the preſent. Now, to make the force of the argument, as certain expoſitors have done, reſult from ſomething implied in the name *God*, is to convert it into a mere ſophiſm. To affirm that the term itſelf includes the perpetual preſervation of the worſhippers, is to take for granted the whole matter in diſpute. To have argued thus with a Sadducee, would have been ridiculous. In Scripture, as every where elſe, the God of any perſons or people, means ſimply that which is acknowledged by them, and worſhipped as ſuch. Thus, Dagon is called the god of the Philiſtines (Jud. xvi. 23.), and Baal-zebub the god of Ekron (2 Ki. i. 3.). But the ſacred writers ſurely never meant to ſuggeſt that theſe gods were the authors of ſuch bleſſings to their worſhippers. Nay, it is not even clear that the latter ever expected ſuch bleſſings from them. What ſeems to have occaſioned the many unnatural turns that have been given to this argument, by later commentators, is ſolely their miſunderſtanding of the word αναστασις, through not attending to the latitude of ſignification wherein it was often uſed in the days of the Apoſtles. Nor is this the only term in which the modern uſe does not exactly tally with the ancient.

34. *Flocked about him*, συνηχθησαν επι το αυτο. E. T. *Were gathered together.* In this interpretation, the clauſe, επι το αυτο, is a mere pleonaſm, as συνηχθησαν alone implies the whole. Now let it be obſerved, that thus much might have been affirmed, in whatever place the Phariſees had met; whereas it is the manifeſt deſign of the Evangeliſt to acquaint us, that the preceding conſutation of the Sadducees occaſioned a concourſe of Phariſees to him, which gave riſe to the following converſation. I approve, therefore, the way in which Caſ. has underſtood the words επι το αυτο, who ſays, *coiverunt eodem*; and not that which has been adopted by the Vul. and Er. who ſay, *convenerunt in unum*; or by the Zu. tranſlator, who ſays, *convenerunt ſimul*; which has been followed by our tranſlators, and which, in effect, deſtroys the connection of the paſſages. The Cam. reads επ' αυτον; but, as in this it is ſingular, we can lay no ſtreſs on it. We can only ſay, that it is of the leſs conſequence, as it makes no difference on the ſenſe. Be. who adopts that reading, ſays *aggregati ſunt apud eum.*

35. *A lawyer*, νομικος. Diſſ. VII. P. II. § 2, 3. and Diſſ. XII. P. V. § 12.

42. *Whoſe ſon ſhould he be?* τινος υιος εστι; E. T. *Whoſe ſon is he?* The indicative mood, in the Gr. of the N. T. has often all the extent which is given to it in Heb. where it ſupplies moſt of the other moods. The import of it in this place is juſtly rendered in Fr. both by L. Cl. and by Beau. *De qui doit-il etre fils?* which anſwers exactly to the way I have tranſlated it.

43. *Call him his Lord.* Diſſ. VII. P. I. § 8.

CHAP. XXIII.

2. *Sit in Moſes's chair.* The Jewiſh Doctors always taught ſitting.

5. *Phylacteries*, φυλακτηρια. A Gr. word exactly, correſponding in etymology to the word *conſervatories.* They were ſcrips of parchment uſed for preſerving ſome ſentences of the law written on them, which, from the literal interpretation of Deut. vi. 8. they thought themſelves obliged, on ſeveral occaſions, eſpecially at their prayers, to wear bound upon their forehead, and on their left arm.

8. *Aſſume not the title of rabbi, for ye have only one teacher*, μη κληθητε ραββι, εις γαρ εστιν υμων ο καθηγητης. E. T. *Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your maſter.* Vul. *Vos nolite vocari rabbi, unus eſt enim magiſter veſter.* The Vul. ſeems to have read διδασκαλος, where it is in the common Gr. καθηγητης; for διδασκαλος is commonly rendered in that verſion *magiſter*; and διδασκαλος is given by John (i. 39.), as an interpretation into Gr. of the Sy. *rabbi.* At the ſame time, it muſt be owned, this concluſion, in regard to the reading found in the copies uſed by the Lat. tranſlator, does not poſſeſs a high degree of probability, inaſmuch as the word καθηγητης is twice rendered by him *magiſter* in v. 10. The ſame may be ſaid of the Sax. and, perhaps, ſome other verſions. But it is equally evident, that the Sy. interpreter has read differently. For the word καθηγητης, in v. 10. (where there is no ſuch difference of reading), is by him, as it ought to be, rendered by a word ſignifying *leader*, or guide; whereas the term *rabbi* is repeated in v. 8. agreeably to his uniform practice in rendering the Gr. διδασκαλος. Beſide this evidence of a different reading, there is a great number of Gr. MSS. which read διδασκαλος, v. 8. This reading is approved by Orig. and Chr. and many modern critics; amongſt whom are Gro. Druſius, Be. Selden, De Dieu, Mill, and Ben. That internal evidence is entirely in favour of this reading. The ſenſe requires that the term, in the latter clauſe, be equivalent to *rabbi* in the former. The διδασκαλος is ſuch a term, we learn not only from the Evangeliſt John, in the place above quoted, but from the uſe of the Sy. interpreter, who always renders the one term by the other; whereas καθηγητης has, in that verſion, a diſtinct interpretation in v. 10. Further, in v. 10. in the common Gr. we find the diſciples prohibited from aſſuming the title of καθηγητης, for the very reaſon repeated which we find given in v. 8. for their not aſſuming the title of rabbi. Thus it ſtands in the two verſes: "Aſſume not the title of rabbi, for ye have

"only

" only one cathegetes; aſſume not the title of cathege-
" tes, for ye have only one cathegetes." For my part, I have ſeen no inſtance of ſuch a tautology, or ſo little congruity of expreſſion, in any of the inſtructions given by our Lord. I therefore approve, in v. 8. the reading of the Sy. interpreter, which is alſo the reading of many MSS. replacing διδασκαλος, which is perfectly equivalent to *rabbi*. I alſo think, with that interpreter, that our Lord meant, in the 10th verſe, to ſay ſomething further than he had already ſaid in the 8th. I acknowledge that the ſentiments are nearly related; but if there had not been ſome difference, there would have been no occaſion for recurring to a different, and even unuſual, term. Our Lord, in my opinion, the more effectually to enforce this warning againſt an unlimited veneration for the judgments and deciſions of men, as a moſt important leſſon, puts it in a variety of lights, and prohibits them from regarding any man with an implicit and blind partiality, as teacher, father, or guide. Now this end is not anſwered, if all or any two of them be rendered as ſynonymous. The very uncommonneſs of the word καθηγητης (for it occurs in no other place of the N. T.), ſhews an effort to ſay ſomething more than was comprehended in the preceding words. And let it be obſerved, that whatever ſerves to prove that its meaning is not coincident with διδασκαλος, ſerves alſo to prove that it is not the authentic reading in v. 8th.

[1] *The Meſſiah*, ὁ Χριστος. This is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. verſions, and in a few MSS.; but the authorities, both in weight and in number, are greatly in its favour. It makes, however, no difference in the ſenſe: becauſe, if not read, the context manifeſtly ſupplies it.

9. *And all ye are brethren.* In the common Gr. the words anſwering to theſe, to wit, παντες δε υμεις αδελφοι εστε, are placed in the end of the preceding verſe, with which they have little connection. I have followed a conſiderable number of copies, in tranſpoſing them to the end of verſe 9th, immediately after, *he alone is your Father who is in heaven*, with which they are intimately connected. The arrangement is manifeſtly more natural, gives a cloſer connection to the ſentiments, and throws more light on the paſſage than the common arrangement, which places this clauſe at the end of v. 8. and thereby adds an abruptneſs to the whole. The intrinſic evidence is therefore entirely in favour of the change.

13, 14, 15, 16. 23. 25. 27. 29. *Woe unto you*, ουαι υμιν. L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

14. *Uſe long prayers for a diſguiſe*, προφασει μακρα προσευχομενοι. E. T. *For a pretence make long prayer.* This is rather too elliptical, and conſequently obſcure. Otherwiſe it does not differ in import from that here given. For what is a *pretence*, but a falſe appearance employed for concealing the truth? The true motive of their attention and aſſiduities was avarice: devotion was only their maſk. This verſe is wanting in ſome MSS. in others it is tranſpoſed, being placed before the 13th.

[1] *Puniſhment*, κριμα. E. T. *Damnation.* Mr. xii. 40. N.

16. 18. *Bindeth not*, ουδεν εστιν. E. T. *It is nothing*; that is, 'Though it is, in appearance, it is not, in reality, an oath; it has not the power of binding.'

23. *Dill*, το ανηθον. E. T. *Aniſe.* In the ſame way it is rendered in all the Eng. verſions I have ſeen. Yet ανηθον does not mean *aniſe*, but *dill*. Our tranſlators have been firſt miſled by a mere reſemblance in ſound, and afterwards implicitly copied by all their ſucceſſors. This miſtake, though of ſmall conſequence, is the more remarkable, as no other but Eng. tranſlators ſeem to have fallen into it. All the La. interpreters ſay rightly *anethum*, the Itn. *aneto*, the Fr. *aneth*, Lu. in his Ger. verſion ſays **till**, and the Sax. verſion *dile*. It is the more obſervable, as in moſt of thoſe languages, the word for *aniſe* has the like reſemblance in ſound to ανηθον, with the Eng. word, though with them it has occaſioned no miſtake. Thus, *aniſe* is, in Gr. ανισον, in La. *aniſum*, in Itn. *aniſo*, and in Fr. *anis*.

[2] *Juſtice, humanity, and fidelity*, την κρισιν, και τον ελεον, και την πιστιν. E. T. *Judgment, mercy, and faith.* The word *judgment*, in our language, when it has any relation to the diſtribution of juſtice, never means the virtue or duty of judging juſtly, but either the right of judging, the act of judging, or the reſult of judging, that is, the doom or ſentence given, right or wrong: ſometimes, when ſpoken in reference to the celeſtial Judge, it means the effect of that ſentence, the puniſhment inflicted. To this the Gr. word κριμα more properly correſponds; though it muſt be owned, that the word κρισις, which, by analogy, ſhould be rather *judicatio* than *judicium*, is alſo often uſed to denote it. But it is evident, that the word κρισις likewiſe ſignifies *diſtributive juſtice*, and even ſometimes *juſtice* in the largeſt acceptation. It is in this place rendered by Caſ. *jus*, and by the five Fr. tranſlators, P. R. Si. Sa. L. CL. and Beau. *la juſtice*. For the meaning of του ελεου, ſee ch. ix. 13.

[2] N. *Fidelity*, or faithfulneſs, is agreed, on all ſides, to be the meaning of την πιστιν here, where it is ranked among the ſocial virtues.

24. *Who ſtrain your liquor, to avoid ſwallowing a gnat*, οι διυλιζοντες τον κωνωπα. E. T. *Who ſtrain at a gnat.* I do not underſtand the import of this expreſſion. Some have thought, that it has ſprung originally from a mere typographical error of ſome printer, who has made it *ſtrain at*, inſtead of *ſtrain out*. Accordingly, moſt of the late Eng. tranſlators have ſaid *ſtrain out*. Yet this expreſſion, *ſtrain out a gnat*, it muſt be confeſſed, ſounds very oddly; and it may be juſtly queſtioned, whether any good Eng. authority can be produced for ſuch a manner of conſtruing the verb. For this reaſon, I thought

thought it safer here, though with the aid of circumlocution, to give what is evidently the sense.

25. *Which within are laden,* εσωθεν δε γεμουσιν. Vul. *Intus autem pleni estis.* This has, doubtless, sprung from a different reading, but is quite unsupported.

2. *Iniquity,* ανομιας. E. T. *Excess.* But there is such a general consent of MSS. ancient versions, and Fathers, for the word αδικιας, that it is hardly possible to doubt of its being the genuine reading. Besides, it suits much better with all the accounts we have, in other places, of the character of Pharisees, who are never, as far as I remember, accused of intemperance, though often of injustice. The former vice is rarely found with those, who, like the Pharisees, make great pretensions to religion.

32. *Fill ye up then,* και υμεις πληρωσατε.. A very few copies, and those not of the highest value, read επληρωσατε, *Ye have filled up;* or, interrogatively, *Do ye fill up?* But as they are unsupported alike by ancient versions and ecclesiastical writers, this reading cannot be admitted. I see no difficulty in considering the words as an ironical order, which is always understood to be a severe reproach, like that in the Æneid, lib. v. *I, sequere Italiam ventis.* Irony is a trope which several times occurs in Scripture; and we have, at least, one other instance, Mr. vii. 9. of its having been used by our Saviour. Ch. xxvi. 45. N.

34. *Banish from city to city,* διωξετε απο πολεως εις πολιν. E. T. *Persecute them from city to city.* That διωκω has both significations, cannot be doubted. But the words, in construction, commonly remove all ambiguity. Διωκειν απο πολεως is unquestionably to banish from, or drive out of a city. If it had been, as in ch. x. 23. where the expression is, οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει, not απο της πολεως, it ought to have been rendered *persecute.* See note on that verse. This distinction seems not to have been attended to by modern translators.

35. *Son of Barachiah.* In the book of Chronicles, to which this passage plainly alludes, Zechariah is called *son of Jehoiada.* But no Gr. MS. extant, or ancient version of this Gospel, has *Jehoiada.* Jerom, indeed, acquaints us, that he found it so in the Heb. Gospel of the Nazarenes. But, considering the freedoms which have been taken with that Gospel, in other places, we cannot account it sufficient authority for changing a term which is supported by the amplest evidence. It is more reasonable to think, with Father Si. that though not mentioned in the O. T. *Jehoiada* must have also had the name *Barachiah.* To have two names was not then uncommon.

2. *The sanctuary,* τ. ναου. L. i. 9. N.

36. *All shall be charged upon this generation.* As I understand it, this expression must not be interpreted as implying that those individual crimes, which happened before the time of the people then living, would be laid to their charge; but that, with every species of cruelty, oppression, and murder, which had been exemplified in former ages, they of that age would be found chargeable; inasmuch as they had permitted no kind of wickedness to be peculiar to those who had preceded them; but had carefully imitated, and even exceeded, all the most atrocious deeds of their ancestors from the beginning of the world. There is no hyperbolé in the representation. The account given of them by Josephus, who was no Christian, but one of themselves, shows, in the strongest light, how justly they are here characterized by our Lord.

CHAP. XXIV.

2. *All this ye see,* ου βλεπετε παντα ταυτα. E. T. *See ye not all these things?* The ου is wanting in many MSS. The Vul. Eth. Cop. Ara. and Sax. versions have no negative particle in this place. As the expression must be read interrogatively, if we admit the negative; and affirmatively, if we reject it; the difference cannot be said to affect the sense. The composition is rather simpler without it. I have, therefore, with many modern critics, omitted it.

3. *The conclusion of this state.* Ch. xii. 32. N.

5. *Many will assume my character,* πολλοι ελευσονται επι τω ονοματι μου. E. T. *Many shall come in my name.* But to come in one's name, signifies, with us, more properly, to come by one's authority or order, real or pretended. Thus, *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.* In this sense, as the Messiah came in the name of God, the Apostles came in the name of the Messiah. This is far from being the sense of the phrase in the passage under review. Here it plainly signifies, that many would usurp his title, make pretensions to his office and character, and thereby lead their followers into the most fatal delusion. That this is the sense here, is plain from what is immediately subjoined, λεγοντες, εγω ειμι ο χριστος. The expression is rendered, not badly, into Itn. by Dio. *Molti veranno sotto il mio nome;* which has been followed in Fr. by the translators of P. R. Si. Sa. and Beau. who say, *Plusieurs viendront sous mon nom;* but L. Cl. says, more explicitly, *Il viendra bien des gens qui prendront mon nom.*

10. *Will be ensnared,* σκανδαλισθησονται. Ch. v. 29. N.

15. *On holy ground,* εν τοπω αγιω. E. T. *In the holy place.* But this expression, with us, invariably denotes *the sanctuary,* or the outer part of the ναος, or temple, strictly so called. This is not the meaning here; neither is τοπος αγιος the name by which *the sanctuary* is ever distinguished in the N. T. It is called simply το αγιον or η σκηνη πρωτη, or αγια; the inner part of the house, or most holy place, being distinguished by the appellation η σκηνη δευτερα, or αγια αγιων. Τοπος αγιος, therefore, denotes any place which, comparatively, may

be denominated *holy*. The whole temple, το ἱερον, including all the courts, is twice ſo termed in the Acts. Nay, the whole city Jeruſalem, with its ſuburbs and environs, was *holy*, compared with other cities; and ſuch, alſo, was the whole land of Judea, compared with other countries. Beſides, it deſerves to be remarked, that the expreſſion here is indefinite, as it wants the article, and is, therefore, more juſtly, as it is more literally, rendered by Sc. *a holy place*, than in the common verſion. The place, or ground, here called *holy* is, undoubtedly, the environs of Jeruſalem. Accordingly, in the parallel paſſage in L. we are told: *When ye ſhall ſee Jeruſalem compaſſed with armies, know, that the deſolation thereof is nigh.*

2. *The deſolating abomination*, το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως. E. T. *The abomination of deſolation;* that is, when expreſſed in the common idiom, *the abomination which deſolateth*, or maketh deſolate. By *abomination*, nothing is more commonly underſtood, in the language of Scripture, than idols of every kind. It is here, generally, and I think, juſtly, ſuppoſed to refer to the Roman ſtandards to be erected round the city, when it would be beſieged by Titus Veſpaſian. The expreſſions uſed here, and in the parallel paſſages, eſpecially when compared with the hiſtory of the ſiege, as related by Joſephus, who, though a Jew, is the beſt commentator on this prophecy, add the higheſt probability to the interpretation now given. Thoſe ſtandards had images on them which were adored by the Romans. Nothing could be more properly ſtyled a deſolating abomination, as they accompanied the armies which came for the utter deſtruction of the place; and as the appearance of thoſe deteſted enſigns was rendered, to all who received this prophecy, a ſure ſignal of the impending ruin.

3. *(Reader, attend)*, (ὁ αναγινοσκων νοειτω.) E. T. *(Whoſo readeth, let him underſtand.)* The verb νοειν, ſignifies not only *to underſtand*, but *to conſider, to mind, to attend*. See 2 Tim. ii. 7. In regard to the words themſelves, after the ſtricteſt examination, I cannot help concluding, that they are not the words of our Lord, and conſequently make no part of this memorable diſcourſe, but the words of the Evangeliſt, calling the attention of his readers to a very important warning and precept of his Maſter, which he was then writing, and of which many of them would live to ſee the utility, when the completion of theſe predictions ſhould begin to take place. I have, therefore, given them in the character by which I always diſtinguiſh the words of the writer. My reaſons for aſcribing them rather to him than to the ſpeaker, are as follows: Firſt, The words are too abrupt, and too much out of the ſyntactic order for a common parentheſis; for if this had been a clauſe immediately connected with the preceding (as thoſe muſt imagine, who think that the reader, here, means the reader of Daniel's prophecy), the τοτε, which follows, ſhould have preceded; and the whole would have run thus: Οταν ιδητε το βδελυγμα το ρηθεν δια Δανιηλ, —εως εν τοπω αγιω· τοτε ὁ αναγινοσκων νοειτω, οι εν τη Ιουδαια φευγετωσαν,—ὁ επι τω δωματος μη καταβαινετω,—και ὁ εν τω αγρω μη επιστρεψατω— With ſo ſmall an alteration, the ſentence would have been grammatical and perſpicuous. As it ſtands, nothing can be more detached than the clauſe under review. At the firſt glance, one is apt to think that there ſhould be a full ſtop at νοειτω. And indeed, if the latter part were entirely away, the reſt would make a complete ſentence. It is not neceſſary that the ſecond member of a ſentence, beginning with ὁταν, ſhould be introduced with τοτε; though this adverb is ſometimes uſed for rendering the expreſſion more energetic. The clauſe, therefore, ὁ αναγινοσκων νοειτω, is here thruſt in between the two conſtituent parts of the ſentence, and properly belongs to neither. That it does not belong to the firſt member, is is evident from the mood, as well as the want of the copulative; and it is excluded from the ſecond, by the following τοτε, which, wherever it is uſed, uſhers in all the ſubjunctive part of the ſentence. But though it cannot be made to coaleſce with our Lord's words, it appears, when underſtood as a call to attention from the Evangeliſt, extremely pertinent. Let it be obſerved, that our Lord pronounced this prophecy about forty years before the fulfilment of what related to Jeruſalem. As this Evangeliſt is ſuppoſed to have written at leaſt eight or ten years after our Lord's crucifixion, this would be about thirty years before the accompliſhment. Jeſus ſaid, when he ſpoke this diſcourſe, that there were of his hearers who would live to ſee the things happen which he had predicted; now as the time was ſtill nearer, when the Evangeliſt wrote it, it was natural for him to conclude, that a great proportion of his readers would be witneſſes of the fatal cataſtrophé, and, therefore, that it was of the laſt importance to them to fix their attention on a warning, wherein the time is ſo critically marked, and on the proper uſe of which, not only their temporal ſafety, but their conviction of the truth of the Goſpel, and, conſequently, their ſpiritual intereſt, might much depend. In this view, this apoſtrophé is, though ſhort, a complete ſentence, and inſerted in the only proper place, between the infallible ſigns of immediate danger, and the conduct then to be purſued. This makes the τοτε, which uſhers in the ſequel of the ſentence, particularly emphatical, as ſerving to recal the former part. Nor is this at all unconformable to the beſt uſe in writing. Such ſhort interruptions, as, *Now mark what follows!* or, *Would God this were duly weighed!* when ſuitably, ſerve to awaken attention, and do not ſuſpend the ſenſe long enough to create obſcurity. Perhaps it will be ſaid, If there be nothing unſuitable in the figure, ought we not rather to think it has been uſed by our Lord, than by the Evangeliſt? The anſwer is obvious. Our Lord did not write, but ſpeak. Thoſe who received inſtruction immediately from him, were not readers, but hearers. Had the expreſſion been, ὁ ακουων νοειτω, it muſt have been part of the diſcourſe; as it is, it ought to be regarded as a call from the writer, and, conſequently, no part of the diſcourſe. There is another objection. The Evangeliſt Mr. uſes the ſame expreſſion exactly in the

ſame

ſame ſituation. This, if it was ſpoken by our Lord, is no more to be wondered at, than their coincidence in any other part of the narrative; but, if it was a ſentiment of the writer, that it ſhould have ſtruck both preciſely in the ſame part of the narration, may appear extraordinary. That this ſhould have happened to two writers, neither of whom knew of the writings of the other, is no doubt improbable. But that is not the caſe here. Mt. who was an Apoſtle, and an eye and ear-witneſs of moſt of the things which he relates, doubtleſs, wrote firſt. That Mr. who had not the ſame advantages, but drew his knowledge in a great meaſure from the Apoſtles of our Lord, particularly Peter, had read with attention Mt.'s Goſpel, there is no reaſon to doubt. And though he does not copy or follow him implicitly (for there is a conſiderable difference of circumſtances in ſeveral parts of the narrative), the coincidence, in many things, is ſo great, as could not otherwiſe be accounted for. And if this acquaintance with our Apoſtle's hiſtory be admitted, it will account ſufficiently for his adopting a figure ſo appoſite to the occaſion.

17. *To carry things*, αραι τι. E. T. *To take any thing*. This is a juſt verſion of the common reading. But there is a very general conſent of MSS. early editions, eccleſiaſtical writers, and ſome ancient verſions, which read τα inſtead of τι. This reading I have, after Mill and Wet. preferred.

22. *If the time were protracted*, ει μη εκολοβωθησαν αι ημεραι εκειναι. E. T. *Except thoſe days ſhould be ſhortened. To ſhorten* any thing, means always to make it ſhorter than it was; or, at leaſt, to make it ſhorter than was intended. Neither of theſe meanings is applicable here. The like exception may be made to the Gr. verb in this place, which is uſed in the idiom of the ſynagogue. See a ſimilar uſe of μεγαλυνω and πλατυνω ch. xxiii. 5.

30. *Then ſhall appear the ſign of the Son of man in heaven*, τοτε φανησεται το σημειον τυ υιυ τυ ανθρωπυ εν τω ουρανω. The Gr. σημειον, like the La. *ſignum*, means not only *ſign* in general, but *ſtandard, banner*, which is indeed one ſpecies of ſign. As the Eng. word *enſign* is equivocal in the ſame way, the paſſage may be rendered, *Then ſhall the enſign of the Son of Man be diſplayed in heaven.* Such military ideas are not unſuitable to the prophetic ſtyle, or even to the tenor of this prophecy, which is highly figurative. But as there appears in the words a plain reference to the queſtion put by the diſciples, v. 3. *What will be the ſign* (το σημειον) *of thy coming?* I judged it better to follow the E. T. and retain the reference. We have no reaſon to think that a particular phenomenon in the ſky is here ſuggeſted. The ſtriking evidences which would be given of the divine preſence, and avenging juſtice, are a ſufficient juſtification of the terms.

36. Three MSS. after ουρανων read και ὁ υιος. The Eth. verſion has read ſo. Some MS. copies of the Vul. have *neque filius*, and ſome of the Fathers ſeem to have read ſo. But it is the general opinion of critics (and I think it is probable) that this clauſe has been borrowed from the parallel place in Mr. where there is no diverſity of reading.

38. *Marrying*, γαμουντες και εκγαμιζοντες. The Eng. word comprehends the ſenſe of both the Gr. words, and therefore needs no addition.

40. *Two men.*
41. *Two women.* } Diſſ. XII. P. IV. § 7, 8, 9.

Immediately after v. 41. we find, in two or three MSS. εσονται δυω επι κλινης μιας, as in L. xvii. 34. from which it has doubtleſs been taken.

51. *Having diſcarded him*, διχοτομησει αυτον. E. T. *Shall cut him aſunder*. But this ill ſuits with what follows of his puniſhment, which ſuppoſes him ſtill alive. It is no anſwer to ſay, that the puniſhment of the wicked will affect both the preſent life and the future. Let it be remembered, that this is a parable wherein our Lord repreſents to us, under the conduct of earthly rulers and maſters, towards their ſubjects and ſervants, in regard to the preſent ſtate only, what will be the conduct of our Lord and Maſter in heaven, in regard to both, but principally the future. Now, to mingle thus, and confound, the letter and the ſpirit of the parable, or the ſtory and the application, and to aſcribe to the earthly maſter, the actions peculiar to the heavenly, would be as contrary to all propriety, as it is repugnant to our Lord's manner. In regard to the word διχοτομεω, we have little or no light from ſcriptural uſe. In the N. T. it occurs only here, and in the parallel paſſage in L. and in the Sep. it occurs only once. But it has been obſerved, that the Sy. uſes the ſame word to expreſs the ſenſe of διχοτομεω here, and in L. which it employs in other places for rendering διχαζω and μεριζω, *to divide, to make a breach, to ſeparate*. Now the language ſpoken by our Lord was a dialect of the Sy. Biſhop Pearce has obſerved that αποτεμνω is uſed by the ſon of Sirach, Ecclus xxv. 26. and εκκοπτω and αποκοπτω by the Apoſtle Paul, Rom. xi. 22. Gal. v. 12. in the ſame ſignification for *diſcarding*, cutting off from one's family or ſociety. Nor needs there ſtronger evidence, eſpecially when the abſurdity implied in the other interpretation is conſidered, to ſatisfy us that this is no more than a Syriaſm, to denote, he will deprive him of his office, and ſo cut him off from his family. Be. has therefore juſtly rendered it *ſeparabit eum*, in which he has been followed by Pite. as well as by all the Fr. tranſlators I am acquainted with, whether they tranſlate profeſſedly from the Gr. or from the Vul. They all ſay, *le ſéparera;* for the Vul. which ſays, *dividet eum*, will bear this verſion. All the Eng. tranſlators of this century, except An. who ſays, *ſhall turn him out of his family*, have followed the common verſion.

51. *With the perfidious*, μετα των υποκριτων. E. T. *With the hypocrites*. But this word with us is confined to that ſpecies of diſſimulation which concerns religion only.

only. It is not ſo with the Gr. term, which is commonly, and not improperly, rendered by Caſ. *ſimulator, diſſembler.* Nay, from the uſe of ὑποκριτης, and its conjugates, in the Sep. and in the Apocrypha, it appears to have ſtill greater latitude of ſignification, and to denote ſometimes what we ſhould call an unprincipled perſon, one unworthy of truſt. I acknowledge, that in the N. T. it commonly, not always, refers to religious diſſimulation. But in a parable, whoſe literal ſenſe regards ſecular affairs, the term ought not to be ſo much limited.

CHAP. XXV.

1. *To meet the bridegroom,* εις απαντησιν τω νυμφιω. Vul. *Obviam ſponſo et ſponſæ; to meet the bridegroom and the bride.* The Sy. Arm. and Sax. verſions have the like addition, και της νυμφης is found in three MSS. This is no ſupport. The internal evidence, ariſing from the cuſtoms, is clearly againſt the addition. The virgins conducted the bride, as her companions, from her father's houſe. The bridegroom went out, from his own houſe, to meet them, and to bring her home with joy and feſtivity.

9. *Leſt there be not enough for us and you; go rather to them who ſell, and buy for yourſelves,* μηποτε ου μη αρκεση ημιν και υμιν· πορευεσθε δε μαλλον προς τους πωλουντας και αγορασατε εαυταις. E. T. *Not ſo, leſt there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that ſell, and buy for yourſelves.* Vul. *Ne forte non ſufficiat nobis et vobis, ite potius ad vendentes, et emite vobis.* Several interpreters have thought that there is an ellipſis in the original. Our tranſlators, who were of this number, have ſupplied it by the words *not ſo.* Elſner and others ſuppoſe, that it ought to be ſupplied by the word ὁρατε, or βλεπετε, before μηποτε, and therefore render the expreſſion, *take care, leſt there be not enough.* But it concerned themſelves ſurely (not thoſe who aſked the favour) to take care, before granting it, that there ſhould be a ſufficiency for both. Such an anſwer as this would not be a refuſal, as was plainly the caſe here, but a conditional grant of the requeſt, the aſkers themſelves being made the judges of the condition. The quotation from Acts v. 39. is nowiſe applicable. The ſupply of ὁρατε before μηποτε και θεομαχοι ευρεθητε, nobody can doubt to be pertinent, becauſe it was entirely the concern of thoſe to whom Gamaliel addreſſed himſelf, to take care that they did nothing which might imply fighting againſt God. It is evident, therefore, that, to make the words before us ſuit the ſenſe, it would be neceſſary to ſupply δει ημας σκοπειν, we muſt take care. But an ellipſis, ſuch as this, is unexampled in theſe writers. I have judged it, therefore, more reaſonable to follow the authors of the Vul. who have not diſcovered any ellipſis in this paſſage. The only thing which can be conſidered as an objection is the δε in the ſecond clauſe. Suffice it for anſwer, that this particle is wanting in the Al. Cam. and other MSS. of principal note, as well as in the Vul. and is rejected by ſome critics of eminence, ancient and modern. And even, were it allowed to ſtand, it would not be impoſſible to ſhow that in ſome inſtances it is redundant.

13. To this verſe there is, in the common editions, a clauſe annexed, which I have not tranſlated, εν ᾗ ὁ υιος του ανθρωπου ερχεται. E. T. *Wherein the Son of Man cometh.* But it is wanting in ſo many MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. and moſt of the ancient verſions, as well as the early eccleſiaſtical writers who commented on the Goſpel, that it cannot, in a conſiſtency with the rules of criticiſm, be received. There is an evident defect in the next verſe,

14. Which is the beginning of a new paragraph. Something (it is not ſaid what) is compared to a man who went abroad. This defect is ſupplied in the common verſion, by theſe words, *The kingdom of heaven is.* In my opinion, it has been originally, *The Son of Man is*, and, from the miſtake of ſuppoſing this to refer to the words preceding (for in the ancient manner of writing, they had neither points nor diſtances between the words), has ariſen the interpolation of ſome words in the 13th verſe, and the want of ſome in the 14th. This, I acknowledge, is but conjecture, though, I think, a very probable one. At any rate, as a ſupply of ſome words muſt be made to v. 14th, thoſe I have uſed are, at leaſt, as well adapted to the words in connection as any other that have been employed for the purpoſe.

26. *Malignant and ſlothful ſervant,* πονηρε δουλε και οκνηρε. E. T. *Thou wicked and ſlothful ſervant.* There are ſeveral words in Gr. and indeed in all languages, which may be juſtly ſaid to be nearly ſynonymous, but not entirely ſo. Of this kind eſpecially are thoſe epithets which relate to character, as κακος, πονηρος, ανομος, αδικος, and ſome others. That they are ſometimes uſed promiſcuouſly, there can be no doubt. And when a tranſlator renders any of them by a general term, as *evil, bad, wicked,* he cannot be ſaid to miſtranſlate them. Nay ſometimes, when uſed without reference to a particular quality in character or conduct, they ought to be ſo tranſlated. There is nevertheleſs a real difference among them; and one of them is fitted for marking, more eſpecially, one ſpecies, or one degree, of depravity, and another for marking another. Αδικος, for example, in its ſtricteſt ſignification, is *unjuſt, lawleſs, criminal.* The firſt relates more to a man's principles of acting, the ſecond to his actions themſelves, conſidered as open violations of law; κακος, when applied to character, anſwers nearly to our word *vicious*, and πονηρος to *malicious*, or *malignant*; κακος is accordingly properly oppoſed to αγαθος, *virtuous*, or δικαιος, *righteous*, for the former term does not occur in Scripture; πονηρος to αγαθος, *good.* Κακια is *vice*, πονηρια *malice* or *malignity.* The uſe of the words in the Goſpel, will be found pretty conformable to the account now given. Thus, in ch. xxiv. 48. the ſervant, who not only neglected his maſter's buſineſs, but ill-treated his fellow-ſervants, and rioted with debauchees, is very properly denominated, κακος δουλος, *a vicious ſervant.* The bad ſervant, in this parable, appears in a different

light. We learn nothing of his revellings or debaucheries; but, firſt, of his *ſloth* which entitles him to the epithet οκνηρε, and, ſecondly, of the *malignity* of his diſpoſition, ſhown in the unprovoked abuſe which, under pretence of vindicating his own conduct, he threw upon his maſter. The cruel and inexorable is alſo called πονηρος, ch. xx. 32. Let it be remarked alſo, that a *malignant*, that is, an *envious eye*, is πονηρος, not κακος οφθαλμος; that the diſpoſition of the Phariſees to our Lord, is ch. xxii. 18. called πονηρια, and that the devil is commonly termed ὁ πονηρος, not ὁ κακος. *Malice* is the moſt diſtinguiſhing feature in his character; but *vice*, which ſeems more connected with human nature, is not ſo properly aſcribed to an unembodied ſpirit. It may be ſaid, Is not then *the evil one* too vague a tranſlation of ὁ πονηρος? I acknowledge it is; but have adopted it merely becauſe it is hazardous, in a term become ſo common, to depart from eſtabliſhed cuſtom. The Gr. ὁ διαβολος does not correſpond exactly to the Heb. *Satan*; yet, as the Seventy had employed it, the penmen of the N. T. did not judge it neceſſary to change it. It is true, however, in general, that there is much more juſtneſs in the epithets employed in the Goſpel, than is commonly attended to. Too many, in tranſlating, ſeem to have no other aim, in regard to theſe, than when the epithet is expreſſive of a bad quality, to ſelect one to anſwer to it, as opprobrious as the language they write, can afford them. I am far from ſaying, that this was the way of thoſe to whom we owe the common verſion. Though ſometimes the import of an original term might have been more exactly hit, they rarely fail to expreſs themſelves ſo as preſerve propriety in regard to the ſpeaker. Now, it deſerves to be remarked, that though our Lord, in his rebukes of the hardened offender (for it is only of ſuch I am ſpeaking), often expreſſes himſelf with ſharpneſs, it is always with juſtice and dignity. In ſome tranſlations, on the contrary, he is made to expreſs himſelf ſo as we ſhould rather call paſſionately. In the paſſage under review, one makes him begin his reply with, *Thou baſe and indolent ſlave*; another with, *Thou vile ſlothful wretch*. But do we ever hear ſuch expreſſions, except from one in a violent paſſion? And can any body ſeriouſly imagine that it adds weight to the ſentence of a judge, to ſuppoſe that he ſpoke it in a rage? Our Lord ſpoke the language of reproof; ſuch interpreters make him ſpeak the language of abuſe. Allow me to add that, in his language, there is more of pointed ſeverity, than in theirs. The reaſon is, his words touch the particular evils; theirs ſignify only evil in general, in a high degree, and are much more expreſſive of the reſentment and contempt of the ſpeaker, than even of the demerit of the perſon addreſſed. The terms, *baſe*, *vile*, *ſlave*, *wretch*, uſed thus, are manifeſtly of this ſort. Like *raſcal*, *villain*, *ſcoundrel*, they are what we properly call ſcurrility. To abound in appellatives of this ſort, is not to be ſevere, but abuſive. Such tranſlators invert that fundamental rule in tranſlating, to make their pen the organ of their author for conveying his ſentiments to their readers, they, on the contrary, make their author, and the moſt dignified characters recorded by him, their inſtruments for conveying to the world, not only their opinions, but even the aſperities of their paſſions.

27. *With intereſt*, συν τοκω. E. T. *With uſury*. Anciently the import of the word *uſury*, was no other than profit, whether great or ſmall, allowed to the lender for the uſe of borrowed money. As this practice often gave riſe to great extortion, the very name at length became odious. The conſideration, that the Jews were prohibited, by their law, from taking any profit from one another for money lent (though they were allowed to take it from ſtrangers), contributed to encreaſe the odium. When Chriſtian commmonwealths judged it neceſſary to regulate this matter by law, they gave to ſuch profit, as does not exceed the legal, the ſofter name of *intereſt*; ſince which time *uſury* has come to ſignify ſolely evtravagant profit diſallowed by law; and which, therefore, it is criminal in the borrower to give, and in the lender to take. As it is not this kind of profit that is here meant, the word *uſury* is now become improper.

29. *From him that hath not.* Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

34. *From the formation of the world*, απο καταβολης κοσμου. E. T. *From the foundation of the world*. Vul. *A conſtitutione mundi*. Ar. *A fundamento mundi*. Er. *Ab exordio mundi*. Zu. *A primordio mundi*. Caſ. *Ab orbe condito*. Be. *A facto mundi fundamento*. It is very uncommon to find every one of theſe tranſlators adopting a different phraſe, and yet, perhaps, more uncommon to find that, with ſo great a variety in the expreſſion, there is no difference in the ſenſe. If any of the abovementioned verſions be more exceptionable than the reſt, it is that which renders καταβολη *foundation*: for, firſt, this term, except in the ſublimer ſorts of poetry, is not very happily applied to the world, in which there is nothing that can be ſaid to correſpond to the foundation of the houſe. Secondly, the word is never uſed in Scripture to expreſs that part of a houſe, or edifice of any kind, which we call *the foundation*: for though there is frequent mention of this part of a building, the word is never καταβολη, but always θεμελιος, or ſome ſynonymous term; and this obſervation holds equally of the N. T. the Sep. and the Jewiſh Apocryphal writings. I admitted that, in the highly figurative ſtyle of the Heb. poets, ſuch an image as that of laying the foundation might be applied to the world. I find it in the O. T. twice applied to the earth, which is nearly the ſame; but it deſerves our notice, that in neither of the places is the word in the Sep. καταβολη or any of its derivatives. One of the paſſages is Pſ. cii. 25. (in the Sep. ci. 26), *Of old thou haſt laid the foundation of the earth*, κατ' αρχας την γην εθεμελιωσας; the other, quite ſimilar, If. xlviii. 13. where the ſame verb is uſed. Thirdly, in the only place where καταβολη occurs in Helleniſtic uſe, as applied to a houſe (which is in the Apocrypha, 2

Mac. ii. 29), it is so far from meaning the foundation, that it denotes the whole structure as contradistinguished to the several parts. See the passage in Gr. and in the common translation, where καταβολη is rightly rendered *building*.

36. *Ye assisted me*, επεσκιψασθε με. E. T. *Ye visited me*. The Eng. word *visited* does not sufficiently express the import of the Gr. verb, when the subject of discourse is a sick person, or one in distress. In such cases, επισκιπτομαι is strictly *visito ut opem feram*. That more is meant here than a visit of friendship, for giving consolation, is probable from the expression used in the next clause, ηλθατε προς με, which is intended to denote such friendly visits, being often all that a Christian brother can do for prisoners. Some late translators render επεσκιψασθε με, *ye took care of me*. This, I think, is in the opposite extreme, as it is hardly applicable to any, but the physician or the nurse.

CHAP. XXVI.

3. The clause και οι γραμματεις is wanting in a few noted MSS. The authors of the Vul. and of some other versions, have not read it in their copies. But as it is found in the Sy. and the much greater number both MSS. and of ancient versions, and is not unsuitable to the scope of the place, I have retained it.

3. *Palace*, αυλην. Though αυλη strictly signifies an open court before the entry of a house or palace (see note on v. 58.), it is not uncommon to employ it by synecdoché for the palace.

5. *Not during the festival* μη εν τη εορτη. E. T. *Not on the feast day*. As there is nothing in the original answering to the word *day*, the term εορτη may include the whole *festival*; to wit, the day of the paschal sacrifice, and the seven days of unleavened bread that followed it. As, therefore, it is not certain that one day only is spoken of, it is better to leave it in the same latitude in which we found it. *Festival* may either denote the first day, which was properly the day of celebrating the passover, or it may include all the eight days.

7. *Balsam*, μυρε. E. T. *Ointment*. But it is evident, from what is said here, and in other places, both in the O. T. and in the New, that their μυρα were not of the consistency of what we denominate *ointment*, but were in a state of fluidity like oil, though somewhat thicker.

12. *It is to embalm me*, προς το ενταφιασαι με. E. T. *For my burial*. The προς το, in several instances, expresses rather the intention of Providence than the intention of the person spoken of. This circumstance is mentioned by our Lord here with a view to suggest the nearness of his funeral. For the import of the word ενταφιασαι, see the note on J. xix. 40.

15. *Thirty shekels*, τριακοντα αργυρια. Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

16. *To deliver him up*, ινα αυτον παραδω. E. T. *To betray him*. We say a man has sold what he has concluded a bargain about, though he has not delivered it to the purchaser. In like manner, Judas *betrayed* his master to the pontiffs, when the terms were settled between them, though he did not then put them in possession of his person.

26. *The loaf*, τον αρτον. E. T. *Bread*. Had it been αρτον, without the article, it might have been rendered either *bread*, or *a loaf*. But as it has the article, we must, if we would fully express the sense, say *the loaf*. Probably, on such occasions, *one loaf*, larger or smaller, according to the company, was part of the accustomed preparation. This practice, at least in the apostolic age, seems to have been adopted in the church, in commemorating Christ's death. To this, it is very probable, the Apostle alludes, 1 Cor. x. 17. Οτι εις αρτος, εν σωμα οι πολλοι εσμεν· οι γαρ παντες εκ του ενος αρτου μετεχομεν. That is, *Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body; for we all partake of the one loaf*. It is in the common translation, *For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread*. Passing at present some other exceptions which might be made to this version, there is no propriety in saying *one bread*, more than in saying *one water*, or *one wine*. Ch. iv. 3. N.

26. *Having given thanks*, ευλογησας. But the number of MSS. many of them of principal note, editions, fathers, &c. that read ευχαριστησας, is so great, as to remove every doubt of its being genuine. Mill and Wet. both receive it. Indeed it may be said to be of little consequence here which way we read, as the two words are admitted by critics to be, in this application, synonymous. Ch. xiv. 19. N.

28. *Of the new covenant*, της καινης διαθηκης. Diss. V. P. III.

29. *Of the product of the vine*, εκ τουτου του γενηματος της αμπελου. E. T. *Of this fruit of the vine*. But the Gr. term for fruit is καρπος. The word γενημα I have literally rendered. Besides, *the fruit of the vine* is not *wine*, but *grapes*; and we speak of *eating*, but never of *drinking*, *fruit*. In the phrase corresponding to this in the Heb. rituals, a term is employed that commonly signifies *fruit*. But our original is the language of the Evangelists, not that of the Rabbies. *The product* is here equivalent to *this product*; because it cannot be this individual, but this in kind, that is meant.

30. *After the hymn*, υμνησαντες. E. T. *When they had sung an hymn*. But υμνεω may be either *I sing*, or *I recite a hymn*. In the latter way it has been understood by the author of the Vul. and by Ar. who render it, *Et hymno dicto*. Cas. to the same purpose, *Deinde dictis laudibus*. But Er. Zu. Be. Pisc. and Cal. *Quum hymnum cecinissent*.

cecinissent. All the modern translations I have seen, except Lu.'s and such as are made from the Vul. follow these last; the Sy. is equally ambiguous with the original, and so are most of the Oriental versions, and the M. G. As it is evident, however, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation, I have followed neither, but used an expression of equal latitude with the original. I have chosen to say *the hymn*, rather than *a hymn*; as it is a known fact, that particular Psalms, namely, the cxiv. and four following, were regularly used after the paschal supper.

31. *I shall prove a snare to you all,* παντες υμεις σκανδαλισθησεσθε εν εμοι. E. T. *All ye shall be offended because of me.* Ch. v. 29. N.

38. *My soul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguish,* περιλυπος εστιν η ψυχη μου εως θανατου. E. T. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.* But this expression, *unto death*, is rather indefinite, and seems to imply a sorrow that would continue till death; whereas, the import of the original is, such a sorrow as is sufficient to cause death, that is, *deadly.* Cas. has expressed the sense thus, *In tanto sum animi dolore ut emoriar.* The last clause sufficiently explains εως θανατου.

39. *Not as I would, but as thou wilt,* ουχ ως εγω θελω, αλλ' ως συ. E. T. *Not as I will, but as thou wilt.* As the Heb. has no subjunctive or potential mood, the indicative, in conformity to the Oriental idiom, is frequently used by the penmen of N. T. in the sense of the subjunctive. Our Lord's *will*, in effect, perfectly coincided with his Father's; because it was his supreme desire, that his Father should be obeyed, rather than that any inclination of his own should be gratified. The first clause, therefore, ought to express, not what was in reality, as matters stood, but what would have been, his desire, on the supposition that his Father's will did not interfere. This is properly expressed by L. Cl. *Non comme je le voudrois, mais comme tu le veux*, which is the way I have adopted.

45. *Sleep on now, and take your rest,* καθευδητε το λοιπον, και αναπαυεσθε. Some late interpreters translate this with an interrogation, thus, *Do ye still sleep on, and take your rest?* This appears, at first, to suit better the words which follow, *Arise, let us be going.* I cannot, however, help favouring the more common, which is also the more ancient, translation. The phrase το λοιπον, and simply λοιπον, when it relates to time, seems always to denote the future. There are only three other places in Scripture, where it has clearly a relation to time, and in regard to these there can be no doubt. The first is Acts xxvii. 20. Λοιπον περιηιρειτο πασα ελπις του σωζεσθαι ημας. E. T. *All hope that we should be saved was then taken away.* The version would have been still better if closer, and instead of *then*, it had been said *thenceforth.* It is rendered by Cas. *Caterò spes omnis salutis nostræ sublata erat.* 2 Tim. iv. 8. where it is rendered by our translators *henceforth*, and Heb. x. 13. where it is rendered *from henceforth.* There is reason, therefore, here to retain the common version; nor is there any inconsistency between this order, which contains an ironical reproof, very natural in those circumstances, and the exhortation which follows, *Arise*, Ch. xxiii. 32. N.

[2] *Of sinners,* αμαρτωλων. The Gr. word expresses more here than is implied in the Eng. term. Our Lord thereby signified, that he was to be consigned to *the heathen*, whom the Jews called, by way of eminence, αμαρτωλοι, because *idolaters.* See Gal. ii. 15. For a similar reason they were also called ανομοι, *lawless, impious*, as destitute of the law of God. The expression δια χειρων ανομων (Acts ii. 23.), ought therefore to be rendered, not as in the E. T. *by wicked hands*, but *by the hands of the wicked*, or rather *impious.*

47. *Clubs,* ξυλων. L. xxii. 52. [2] N.

50. *Friend,* εταιρε. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

65. *Whoever hath recourse to the sword*—a proverbial expression not to be rigidly interpreted. Such sayings are understood to suggest what frequently, not what always, happens. It seems to have been introduced at this time, in order to signify to the disciples that such weapons as swords were not those by which the Messiah's cause was to be defended.

55. *A robber,* λησταν. E. T. *A thief.* Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

58. *The court of the high priest's house,* της αυλης του αρχιερεως. E. T. *The high priest's palace.* From v. 69. as well as from what we are told in the other Gospels, it is evident that Peter was only in the court without, which, though enclosed on all sides, was open above, nor was it anywise extraordinary to kindle a fire in such a place. L. xxii. 55. N.

[2] *Officers,* υπηρεται. E. T. *Servants.* Υπηρεται means, commonly, servants of the public, or official servants of those in authority, the officers of a judicatory.

59. *And the elders,* και οι πρεσβυτεροι. This clause is wanting in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions, and in two or three MSS. It is not wanting in the Sax. which makes it probable that the Itc. read as we do.

60. *But though many false witnesses appeared, they found it not,* και ουχ' ευρον, και πολλων ψευδομαρτυρων προσελθοντων, ουχ' ευρον. The repetition of ουχ' ευρον, in the common copies, is very unlike the manner of this writer. In the Vul. Sy. Cop. Ara. and Sax. the phrase is found only once. It is not repeated in the Com. nor in some ancient MSS. As it makes no addition to the sense, and does not perfectly agree with the strain of the narrative, I have followed the example of some of the best ancient translators, in avoiding the repetition.

63. *I adjure thee,* εξορκιζω σε. This appears to have been the Jewiſh manner of adminiſtering an oath. The Heb. השבית *hiſhbiang*, which in the O. T. is commonly, by our interpreters, rendered, *to make one ſwear*, is juſtly tranſlated, by the Seventy, ορκιζω or εξορκιζω. The name of the deity ſworn by was ſubjoined, ſometimes with, ſometimes without, a prepoſition. Thus, Gen. xxiv. 3. where we have an account of the oath adminiſtered by Abraham to his ſteward, which is rendered in the Eng. Bible, *I will make thee ſwear by the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth*, is thus expreſſed in the Sep. εξορκιω σε Κυριον τον Θεον του ουρανου και της γης; *I adjure thee by Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth.* After ſuch adjuration, by a magiſtrate or lawful ſuperior, the anſwer returned by the perſon adjured, was an anſwer upon oath: a falſe anſwer was perjury; and even the ſilence of the perſon adjured was not deemed innocent. Many examples of this uſe of the ſimple verb ορκιζω, which is of the ſame import with the compound, may be diſcovered by conſulting Trommius' Concordance. Mr. v. 7. N.

64. *At the right hand of the Almighty,* εκ δεξιων της δυναμεως. E. T. *On the right hand of power.* The Heb. word הגבורה *hageburah, power*, or *might*, in the abſtract, that is, *omnipotence*, or ſupreme power, was become, with Jewiſh writers, a common appellation for God As the abſtract, here, does not ſuit the idiom of our tongue, and as, in meaning, it is equivalent to our word, *the Almighty*, I have uſed this term in the tranſlation. The Vul. ſays, *Virtutis Dei.*

65. *Blaſphemy.* Diſſ. X. P. II.

68. *Divine to us,* προφητευσον ημιν. *Propheſy unto us.* But the Eng verb, to propheſy, always denotes to foretell what is future: here a declaration is required concerning what was paſt. The verb, *to divine*, is applicable to either, as it denotes, ſimply, to declare any truth not diſcoverable by the natural powers of man. From the Evangeliſts Mr. and L. we learn that our Lord was at this time blindfolded.

CHAP. XXVII.

2. *The procurator.* Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 17.

5. *Strangled himſelf,* απηγξατο. E. T. *Hanged himſelf.* The Gr. word plainly denotes *ſtrangling*; but does not ſay how, by hanging, or otherwiſe. It is quite a different term that is uſed in thoſe places where *hanging* is mentioned. It may alſo be rendered, *was ſtrangled*, or *was ſuffocated.* I have, in the above verſion, followed the Sy. the common tranſlation follows the Vul. which ſays, *laqueo ſe ſuſpendit.*

6. *The ſacred treaſury,* τον κορβαναν. E. T. *The treaſury.* The word, in the original, occurs in no other paſſage in Scripture. Joſephus makes uſe of it, and interprets it, τον ιερον θησαυρον. It is formed from κορβαν, originally Heb. which alſo occurs but once in the Gr. form, Mr. vii. 11. and ſignifies that which is given or *devoted to God.* The unlawfulneſs of putting the thirty ſhekels into this repoſitory, aroſe from this ſingle circumſtance, that it contained the treaſure conſecrated to God.

8. *That field is called the field of blood,* εκληθη ο αγρος εκεινος αγρος αιματος. Vul. *Vocatus eſt ager ille Haceldama, hoc eſt ager ſanguinis.* To the words, *Haceldama, hoc eſt* as there is nothing that correſponds in any MS. or tranſlation, except the Sax. and as they are quite ſuperfluous, there can be no doubt that they are an interpolation from Acts i. 19. With inſertions of this kind, the Latins have been thought, even by ſome of their own critics, more chargeable than the Greeks.

9. *Jeremiah.* The words here quoted are not in any prophecy of Jeremiah extant. But they bear a ſtrong reſemblance to the words of Zechariah. xi. 12, 13. One MS. not of great account, has Ζαχαριε. Another adds no name to προφητου. There is none added in the firſt Sy. verſion. And it would ſeem, from a remark of Auguſtine, that ſome copies, in his time, named no Prophet. But as all the other MSS. now extant, even thoſe of the greateſt antiquity, the Vul. and the other ancient verſions, the Sy. alone excepted, all the earlieſt eccleſiaſtical writers, read juſt as we do in the common editions, I did not think a deviation from theſe could be denominated other than an emendation merely conjectural.

9, 10. "*The thirty ſhekels, the ſtipulated price at which* "*he was valued, I took, as the Lord appointed me, from the* "*ſons of Iſrael, who gave them for the potter's field.*" ελαβον τα τριακοντα αργυρια, την τιμην του τετιμημενου, ον ετιμησαντο απο υιων Ισραηλ· και εδωκαν αυτα εις τον αγρον του κεραμεως, καθα συνεταξε μοι ο Κυριος. E. T. *They took the thirty pieces of ſilver, the price of him that was valued; whom they of the children of Iſrael did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.* ελαβον may be either the firſt perſon ſingular, or the third perſon plural. The latter hypotheſis has been adopted by the Vul. and the majority of tranſlators, ancient and modern. The former has been preferred by the Sy. and the Per. tranſlators. There can be no doubt, that their way of rendering gives more perſpicuity, as well as more grammatical congruity, to the ſentence. As the words ſtand in moſt verſions, they appear to repreſent the action of one, as the obedience of an appointment given to another. Thus: *They took the ſilver pieces and gave them* ——*as the Lord appointed* [not *them*, but] *me.* This incongruity, and the obſcurity ariſing from it, are entirely removed by the other interpretation, which has alſo this advantage, that it is more conformable to the expreſſion of Zechariah referred to, ελαβον τας τρια-

ουτοι αρχουσι. So it runs in the Sep. Now there is no ambiguity in the Heb. verb, as there is in the Gr. The former cannot be rendered, but by the firſt perſon ſingular. This would certainly have determined all tranſlators to preſer this manner, as being at once more conformable to ſyntax, to common ſenſe, and to the import of the paſſage, to which the alluſion is made. But there aroſe a difficulty from the verb εδωκαν, which appears to be coupled, in conſtruction, with ελαβον. Now, on the ſuppoſition that it was ſo conſtrued, as εδωκαν could be no other than the third perſon plural, ελαβον muſt be ſo too. In one of the copies, called Evangeliſtaries (which are MSS. of the Goſpels, divided according to the manner of reading them in ſome church or churches), it is εδωκα, in the firſt perſon ſingular. The Sy. interpreter ſeems alſo to have read εδωκα, in the copy or copies uſed by him. But this is too ſlight an authority, in my opinion, for deſerting the common reading. I, therefore, entirely approve the ingenious ſolution that has been given by Knatchbull, and read εδωκαν in the third perſon plural, not as coupled by the conjunction with ελαβον, but as belonging to a ſeparate clauſe; in which caſe, the verſion will be literally as follows: *I took the thirty ſhekels (the price of him that was valued, whom they valued) from the ſons of Iſrael (and they gave them for the potter's field), as the Lord appointed me.* The verſion, given in the text, is the ſame in meaning, but more perſpicuouſly expreſſed. Here, indeed, the words, *and they*, ſupply the place of the relative *who*, a very common Hebraiſm. It is ſurely much leſs uſual, though I will not ſay unexampled, to make, as our tranſlators do, the phraſe απο υιων Ισραηλ, ſerve as a nominative to the verb ετιμησαντο.

11. *Thou art the king of the Jews?* Συ ει ο βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων; E. T. *Art thou the King of the Jews?* Vul. Ar. Er. Cal. *Tu es rex Judæorum?* There can be no doubt that this is an interrogation; but it is equally certain, that the form of the expreſſion is ſuch as admits us to underſtand it either as an affirmation, or as an interrogation. Now, I imagine, it is this particularity, in the form of the queſtion, which has given riſe to the cuſtomary affirmative anſwer συ λεγεις, wherein the anſwerer, without miſtaking the other's meaning, expreſſes his aſſent to the words, conſidered in the ſimple form, as an aſſertion; and this aſſent ſerves equally as an anſwer to the queſtion. But this would not be a natural manner of anſwering, if the form of the queſtion were ſuch as could not admit being interpreted otherwiſe than as a queſtion. In that caſe, nothing can, with any propriety, be ſaid to have been advanced by the aſker. As ſometimes, with us, a queſtion is put deriſively, in the form of an aſſertion, when the propoſer conceives, as ſeems to have happened here, ſome abſurdity in the thing, I thought it beſt, after the example of ſo many Lat. interpreters, to adopt the equivocal, or rather the oblique, form of the original expreſſion. The ambiguity is not real, but apparent. The accent in ſpeaking, and the point of interrogation in writing, do, in ſuch caſes, ſufficiently mark the difference. Dio. has alſo adopted this method, and ſaid *Tu ſei il rè de' Judei?* All the other modern verſions I have ſeen, follow Be. Piſc. and Caſ. who put the queſtion in the direct form, the two former ſaying, *Tune es*—— the other, *Eſne tu*—— Leo de Juda ſays, *Es tu*——

17, 18, 19, 20, 21. The reader will obſerve, that there is, in theſe verſes, in the common verſion, ſome appearance both of tautology and of incoherency, which, in my opinion, is entirely removed, by including the 18th and 19th in a parentheſis, and underſtanding the 21ſt as a reſumption, after this interruption, of what had been mentioned in the 17th verſe. Let the whole paſſage in the original be carefully examined, and compared with the common verſion, and with this.

24. *Of this innocent perſon,* τυ δικαιυ τυτυ. E. T. *Of this juſt perſon.* Caſ. *Hujus innocentis.* L. Cl. *De cet innocent.* The forenſic ſenſe (as I may call it) of the Heb. word צדיק *tſadik*, and conſequently of the Gr. δικαιος, adopted as equivalent, is no more than *innocent*, or *not guilty*, of the crime whereof he ſtands accuſed. This appears from many places of the O. T. which relate to judicial proceedings, particularly Deut. xxv. 1. and Prov. xvii. 15. where it is contraſted with a word commonly rendered *wicked*, and which, in its forenſic meaning, denotes no more than *guilty* of the crime charged. Pilate does not appear to have known any thing of our Lord's character, and therefore could pronounce nothing poſitively. But he could not fail to ſee, that this accuſation brought before him, ſprang from malice, and was unſupported by evidence.

29. *Of thorns,* εξ ακανθων. Biſhop Pearce has remarked, in a note on this verſe, that ακανθων may be the genitive plural, either of ακανθα, *thorn*, or of ακανθος, the herb called *bear's-foot*, a ſmooth plant, and without prickles. But, in ſupport, of the common verſion, let it be obſerved, firſt, that in both Mr. and J. it is called στεφανος ακανθινος. This adjective, both in ſacred uſe, and in claſſical, plainly denotes, *ſpineus*, *thorny*; that it ever means made of *bear's foot*, I have ſeen no evidence. Thus, in the Sep. (If. xxxiv. 13.) in the common editions, the phraſe, ακανθινα ξυλα, is uſed for prickly ſhrubs. 2dly, That the word ακανθα, *thorn*, both in the right caſe, and in the oblique caſes, occurs in ſeveral places of the N. T. and of the Sep. is unqueſtionable. But that in either the word ακανθος is found (leaving this, and the parallel paſſage in J. about which the doubt is raiſed, out of the queſtion), has not been pretended. 3dly, Not one of the ancient, or of the Oriental, verſions, or, indeed, of any verſions known to me, favours this hypotheſis. The Itc. and the Sy. which are the oldeſt, both render the word *thorns*. The ſilence of eccleſiaſtical writers, for near two centuries, if this can

properly be pleaded, after what has been obſerved of the ancient Itc. and Sy. interpreters, and eſpecially, when we conſider how few of the works of the earlieſt Fathers are extant, proves nothing at all. That Tertullian, the firſt of the Lat. Fathers, mentions the crown as being of thorns, and ſpeaks in ſuch a manner as clearly ſhows that he had never heard of any different opinion, or even doubt, raiſed upon the ſubject, is very ſtrong evidence for the common tranſlation. Add to this, that an eminent Gr. Father, Clement of Alexandria, a contemporary of Tertullian, underſtood the word in the ſame manner. "It is abſurd," ſays he (Pæd. l. 2. c. 8.), "in us, who hear that our Lord, "was crowned with thorns, ακανθαις, to inſult the ve- "nerable ſufferer, by crowning ourſelves with flowers." Several paſſages, equally appoſite, might be given from the ſame chapter, but not one word that betrays a ſuſpicion, that the term might be, or a ſuggeſtion that ever it had been, otherwiſe interpreted. To this might be added all the ancient commentators, both Gr. and Lat. There is, therefore here, the higheſt probability, oppoſed to mere conjecture.

34. *Wormwood,* χολης E. T. *Gall.* The word χολη is uſed with great latitude in the Sep. The Heb. word, ſignifying *wormwood,* is twice ſo rendered, Prov. v. 4. Lam. iii. 15. At other times, it ſeems to denote any bitter or poiſonous infuſion, that taſted like gall. To give ſuch a beverage to criminals before their execution, was then uſed, in order to make them inſenſible of the horrors of death.

35. After κληρον, there is, in the common Gr. ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν υπο του προφητου, Διεμερισαντο τα ιματια μου εαυτοις, και επι τον ιματισμον μου, εβαλον κληρον. E. T. *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the Prophet,* "*They* "*parted my garments among them, and upon my veſture* "*did they caſt lots.*" Theſe words are wanting in a very great number of MSS. in which the moſt valuable are included, in the works of ſome ancient commentators, in ſeveral early verſions and editions. Though the Vul. in the common editions, has this clauſe, it is not found in many of their beſt MSS. As it was a practice, with ſome tranſcribers, to correct, and, as they imagined, improve, one Goſpel by another, it is extremely probable, that this clauſe has been, at firſt, copied out of J. to whoſe Goſpel it properly belongs.

40. 43. *God's Son.* See note on ch. iv. 3. and on v. 54. of this ch.

42. *Cannot he ſave himſelf?* εαυτον ου δυναται σωσαι; E. T. *Himſelf he cannot ſave.* The words may be underſtood, either as an affirmation, or as a queſtion. I think, with Biſhop Pearce, that the latter way is better ſuited to the context, as well as more emphatical.

45. *The whole land,* πασαν την γην. The word γη is equivocal, and may be rendered either *earth* or *land,* Some have thought, that the addition of πασα, in this place, ought to determine our preference in favour of the moſt extenſive ſignification of the word; but this argument is not concluſive. No two expreſſions can be more ſimilar than εγενετο λιμος επι πασαν την γην, L. iv. 25. and Mt's. expreſſion here, εγενετο σκοτος επι πασαν την γην. Without ſome ſpecial reaſon, therefore, nothing could be more capricious than to render the former, *There was famine throughout all the land;* and the latter, *There was darkneſs over all the earth.*

46. *Eli, eli, lama ſabachthani.* It is to be obſerved, that theſe are not the very words of the Heb. original of the Pſalm quoted: but they are in what is called Syrochaldaic, at that time the language of the country, the dialect which our Lord ſeems always to have uſed. It is not entirely the ſame with the language of the Sy. verſion, but very near it. The only difference, in this exclamation, between the Pſalm and the Goſpel, is that, in the latter, we have *ſabachthani* where, in the former, we have *ghazabthani.* The Sy. interpreter has not, as all other interpreters, given firſt the very words of our Lord on this occaſion, and then an interpretation of them in the language he was writing; but, by a very ſmall alteration on ſome of the words, he has made them ſuit the dialect of his verſion, ſo as to need no other interpretation. In Sy. they run thus, *Eil, eil, lamana ſabachthani?* Yet, even here, one would ſuſpect a different reading; *Eil* ſignifies *God,* not *my God.* The reader will perceive that the difference in ſound is inconſiderable. See the preface to this Goſpel, § 19. and Mr. xv. 34. N.

47. *Some of the by-ſtanders ſaid,* "*He calleth Elijah.*" Theſe muſt have been ſome of the ſtrangers, of whom there was always a great concourſe at the paſſover, who did not underſtand the dialect then ſpoken in Jeruſalem.

50. *Reſigned his ſpirit,* αφηκε το πνευμα. E. T. *Yielded up the ghoſt.* This is exactly agreeable to the ſenſe, though the phraſe is ſomewhat antiquated. Dod. *Diſmiſſed his ſpirit.* He thinks, after Jerom, that there was ſomething miraculous in our Lord's death, and ſuppoſes it to have been the immediate effect of his own volition. Whether this was the caſe or not, the words here uſed give no ſupport to the hypotheſis. The phraſe, αφειναι την ψυχην, which is very ſimilar, is uſed by the Seventy, Gen. xxxv. 18. ſpeaking of Rachel's death. The like expreſſions often occur in Joſephus, and other Gr. writers. Nay, an example has been produced, from Euripides, of this very phraſe, αφηκε πνευμα, for *expired.*

51. *The veil of the temple.* Probably the inner veil, which divided *the holy* from *the moſt holy place.*

54. *The ſon of God,* θεου υιος. E. T. *The Son of God.* Let it be obſerved, that the phraſe, here, is neither ὁ υιος του θεου, *the ſon of God,* nor υιος του θεου, *a ſon of God;* but

but it is υιος θυ, both words being uſed indefinitely, *a ſon of God;* an expreſſion perfectly ſuitable in the mouth of a polytheiſt, like the Roman centurion. The reaſon of my uſing the definite article before word *ſon*, is, becauſe it is more conformable to our idiom. If the father be expreſſed indefinitely, though the definite article be prefixed to *ſon*, it has no emphaſis in Eng. Thus, ſhould one ſay, of a perſon enquired about, He is *the ſon of a merchant*, nobody would underſtand, as implied in this anſwer, that he is either *the only ſon*, or *the eldeſt*. Yet this mode of anſwering is more common than to ſay, He is a ſon of a merchant. But when the father is mentioned by his proper name, or diſtinguiſhed by his office from every other perſon, we uſe the indefinite article before the word *ſon*, when we mean to expreſs no more than the relation. Thus: He is *a ſon of the Lord Chancellor*, or *of Mr. Such-a-one*. Likewiſe, in deducing a genealogy, the definite article is frequently uſed before *ſon*, but without any meaning. Thus, we may ſay: *Judah the ſon of Jacob, the ſon of Iſaac, the ſon of Abraham*. The uſual Fr. idiom is, in this, preferable, which is now alſo adopted in Eng. They uſe no article, definite or indefinite, in ſuch caſes, but ſay, *Juda fils de Jacob, fils d'Iſaac, fils d'Abraham*. So much for anomalies, in the uſe of articles that obtain amongſt ourſelves. Yet nothing would be more unjuſt than to conclude, from this, that our articles have no diſtinctive import, but are uſed promiſcuouſly and capriciouſly. Let us not, then, fall into the like fallacy, in arguing about the articles of other languages, becauſe of a few exceptions which, to us, may appear capricious. I know it may be objected to what is advanced above, concerning the Gr. article, that in this ch. v. 43. the words θυ υιος occur without any article, where the term θυ muſt nevertheleſs be underſtood definitely. But, when a phraſe, expreſſed fully, comes ſoon to be repeated; articles, and other definitives, ſuch as pronouns and epithets, are, for brevity's ſake, often omitted. In v. 43. there is an implied reference to what was expreſſed more fully, υιος του θυ, v. 40.; the ſame ſtrain of ſcoffing is continued through the whole. Inſtances of ſuch omiſſions, in the like caſes, are very numerous. I admit, alſo, in regard to ſubſtantives in general, that the article is ſometimes omitted, when the meaning is definite, but hardly ever added when it is indefinite. I am not certain whether υιος, in the two verſes now referred to, ſhould be rendered *a ſon*, or *the ſon*. Plauſible reaſons may be advanced for each. I have avoided the deciſion, by rendering it in both verſes, *God's ſon*, which may mean either. This, as I ſignified before, is the method I chuſe to take, in caſes which appear doubtful. But if the words in connection be ever ſufficient to remove all doubt, they are ſufficient in v. 54. That the expreſſion in queſtion came from one who, as he believed a plurality of Gods, could ſcarcely have ſpoken otherwiſe than indefinitely, is perfectly deciſive. Let it be obſerved, further, that the ſame indefinite expreſſion is uſed in the parallel place, Mr. xv. 39. See ch. iv. 3. N. ch. xiv. 33. N. Mr. i. 1. N.

56. *Mary Magdalene*, Μαρια η Μαγδαλην. It might be rendered, more literally, and even properly, *Mary the Magdalene*, or *Mary of Magdala*, in the ſame way as Ιησους ο Ναζαρηνος is *Jeſus the Nazarene*, or *Jeſus of Nazareth*. There can be no doubt that this addition, employed for diſtinguiſhing her from others of the ſame name, is formed from *Magdala*, the name of a city mentioned ch. xv. 39. probably the place of her birth, or at leaſt of her reſidence. The appellation, *Magdalene*, ſtands, now, however, ſo much on the footing of a proper name, that any the ſmalleſt change would look like an affectation of accuracy in things of no moment.

61. *The other Mary*, η αλλη Μαρια. Sc. *Another Mary*. But this laſt verſion is agreeable neither to the letter nor to the ſenſe of the original. I ſhould not have taken notice of it, were it not to ſhow how groſsly the import of the articles is ſometimes miſtaken, and how ſtrangely they are confounded. This learned writer, in his notes, after mentioning the common verſion, *the other Mary*, adds, "This might be proper, if there were but two Maries." I anſwer, it is ſufficient for the preſent purpoſe, that there were but two Maries, whom the Evangeliſt had mentioned a very little before, to wit, at v. 53. Theſe were *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joſes*. He now again names Mary Magdalene, adding, *and the other Mary*. Can any perſon, who reflects, be at a loſs to diſcover, that he ſays *the other*, to ſave the repetition of *the mother of James and Joſes?* In order to evince the redundancy, not to ſay, inſignificancy, of the Gr. articles, this author produces two other examples, which, doubtleſs, have appeared to him the moſt convincing. The firſt is, Mt. x. 23. Οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει ταυτη, φευγετε εις την αλλην, which I have rendered, *when they perſecute you in one city flee to another;* but which is, in the common verſion, *When they perſecute you in this city, flee ye into another*. Now, to me, this paſſage, ſo far from ſhowing the Evangeliſt's negligence, in his manner of uſing the articles, proves his accuracy. If he had expreſſed the firſt clauſe indefinitely, οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν μια πολει, and added, φευγετε εις την αλλην, this writer's reaſoning would have been juſt; nor could there have been a clearer evidence, that the articles were ſometimes uſed without any determinate meaning. But as the firſt clauſe was expreſſed definitely, propriety required that the ſecond ſhould be definite alſo. Εις την αλλην, therefore, in this place is equivalent to εις την εκεινην, and oppoſed to εν τη πολει ταυτη. Since our tranſlators, therefore, rendered the firſt clauſe, *When they perſecute you in this city*, they ought to have rendered the ſecond, *flee into that*, or, *into that other:* for this is one of thoſe inſtances (and there are ſeveral, as has been often remarked by grammarians) wherein the article has the force of a pronoun. I have choſen, in this tranſlation, to expreſs the whole indefinitely, as this manner ſuits better the genius of our tongue, and is equally expreſſive of the ſenſe. The other way, in a language wherein it flows naturally and eaſily, does

no

not, I acknowledge, want its advantages in point of vivacity. But to begin in one manner, and end in the other, offends alike againſt propriety and elegance. The other example, taken from J. xviii. 15. I ſhould admit, without a moment's heſitation, to be clearly in favour of Dr. Sc.'s doctrine, if I did not conſider it as an erroneous reading. See note on that verſe.

63. *Within three days,* μετα τρεις ἡμερας. Ch. ii. 16. [3] N.

64. *Command that the ſepulchre be guarded.* This, as being a ſervile work, it might be thought, they would not aſk to be done on the Sabbath. But we ought to reflect, that they aſked this of Romans, whom they did not conſider as bound by the law of the Sabbath. Jews, to this day, do not ſcruple to avail themſelves of the work done by Chriſtians on the Sabbath. See the note on v. 65.

65. *Ye have a guard.* Some have thought that the guard, here meant, was the Levites, who kept watch in the temple (L. xxii. 52. N.); others, that it was a band of Roman ſoldiers who, during the great feſtivals, guarded the porches of the outer court, and had it in charge to quell any tumult which might ariſe there, or in the city. Of this guard extraordinary, at their public ſolemnities, mention is made by Joſephus (Antiq. l. viii. c. iv.). That it was not the Levites, the ordinary temple watch, who are here alluded to, appears from the following reaſons: 1ſt, The ſervice of that watch does not ſeem to have extended beyond the walls of the temple. 2dly, If their aſſiſtance had been judged neceſſary, the chief prieſts had no occaſion to recur to Pilate for obtaining it, as, by the conſtitution, they who ſerved in the temple were under the ſole direction of the prieſts. 3dly, As the day, on which the aſſault ſeems to have been dreaded, was the Sabbath, it is probable that they would chuſe to have Roman ſoldiers, whom they could lawfully employ, and who would be reſtrained by no religious ſcruple, rather than Jews, for ſuppreſſing any tumult on that day. 4thly, Had the guard been Levites, they were accountable only to the chief prieſts; whereas, being Romans, they needed the prieſts, as mediators with Pilate, before they could be induced, by a ſum of money, to propagate a falſehood, which reflected ſo much on themſelves as military men, and even expoſed them to puniſhment. Laſtly, the name κουστωδια, here given them, which is neither Gr. nor Sy. but a La. word, ſhows clearly they were *Romans.* It may be objected, 'But, in that caſe, would 'the procurator have ſaid, ye have a guard, thus re'preſenting the Roman ſoldiers as under their autho'rity?' I take this to be no more than a civil way of granting their requeſt. As, in modern language, we ſhould ſay, 'The guard is at your ſervice.'

CHAP. XXVIII.

9. *When they were gone,* ὡς δε επορευοντο. E. T. *And as they went.* Dod. and Wy. *As they were going.* If, in Helleniſtic uſe, accuracy were obſerved in regard to the verbs, the laſt would be the only proper way of rendering the expreſſion. But from the very different nature of the Oriental tongues, there has ariſen, among Jewiſh writers, an indefinite application of the Gr. tenſes and moods, which renders them, in ſome caſes, not a little equivocal. The expreſſion employed, Acts xx. 18. ὡς δε παρεγενοντο προς αυτον, is extremely ſimilar to that under review; yet no Eng. interpreter has ſcrupled to render it, *When they were come* (not *coming*) *to him,* as this is a meaning to which the words connected evidently confine it. Now, as the words are ſuſceptible of this interpretation, candour ſeems equally to require it, when it is eſſential to the conſiſteney of the ſacred hiſtorians.

[2] This whole clauſe, ὡς δε επορευοντο απαγγειλαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου, is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. Ara. and Sax. verſions. It is wanting alſo in the Cam. and many other MSS. Chr. appears not to have read it. It is rejected by Mill and ſome other modern critics. Beſide theſe, one or two MSS. which retain ὡς δε επορευοντο, omit απαγγειλαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου, which are alſo the concluding words of the former ſentence. As the latter clauſe, when retained, makes not the ſmalleſt alteration in the ſenſe, I thought the above authorities might be held reaſon ſufficient for paſſing it.

[3] *Rejoice,* χαιρετε. E. T. *All hail.* The term *hail,* in ſaluting, rarely occurs now, except in Scripture and poetry. However, as, in ſome caſes, we have no word which can properly ſupply its place, as it is very well underſtood, and by Scriptural uſe, as well as antiquity, rendered reſpectable, it ought not, in a tranſlation of the Goſpels, to be entirely laid aſide; at the ſame time, it muſt be owned, that when the ſalutation ſtands alone, as in this paſſage, or is not accompanied with ſome compellation to the perſons ſaluted, its appearance is rather awkward. Our tranſlators have been ſo ſenſible of this, as to judge it neceſſary to inſert the word *all,* to render the expreſſion fuller. But even with this addition it ſtill ſounds oddly, and has been rarely copied by later tranſlators, ſome of whom have preferred the way of circumlocution. *I ſalute you,* ſays one. Cold and formal. *God ſave you,* ſays another, which ſeems to imply ſome impending danger. To me, the literal tranſlation of the Gr. word appears, in point of propriety, as well as ſimplicity, preferable to any of theſe methods.

17. *Threw themſelves proſtrate,* προσεκυνησαν. Ch. ii. 2. [2] N.

19, 20. *Convert all the nations—teaching them,* μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη—διδασκοντες αυτους. E. T. *Teach all nations—teaching them.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Be. Cal. Piſc. *Docete omnes gentes—docentes eos.* Caſ. employs the ſame verb, though in a different form; inſtead of *Euntes docete,* ſaying, after his manner, *Vadite doctum—docentes eos.* The Sy. has preſerved the diſtinction very properly. There are manifeſtly three things which our Lord here diſtinctly enjoins his Apoſtles to execute

with regard to the nations, to wit, μαθητευειν, βαπτιζειν, διδασκειν, that is, to convert them to the faith, to initiate the converts into the church by baptiſm, and to inſtruct the baptiſed in all the duties of the Chriſtian life. Our tranſlators have, after the whole current of La. interpreters, confounded the firſt and the laſt, rendering both word by the ſame Eng. word *teach*. The foreign tranſlators have not been ſo implicit followers. Dio. ſays, *Ammaeſtrate tutte le genti—inſegnando loro*. G. F. *Endoctrinez toutes nations—les enſeignans*. L. Cl. *Faites des diſciples parmi toutes les nations—apprenez leur*. Beau. with whom Si. agrees, has not expreſſed, with the ſame diſtinctneſs, the two parts of the charge; for though the terms he employs are different, they are nearly ſynonymous, *Enſeignez toutes les nations—leur apprenant*. P. R. and Sa. though they tranſlate from the Vul. where the error originated, have diſtinguiſhed them better, *Inſtruiſez tous les peuples—leur aprenant*. The like variety is to ſound in our late Eng. verſions, none of which has followed here the common tranſlation. An. Hey. and Wor. ſay, *Inſtruct all nations*. Dod. *Proſelyte all nations*. Wy. *Make diſciples in all nations*. Wa. *Make diſciples of all the nations*. Sc. and Wel. *Diſciple all nations*. They all render the beginning of the 20th v. *Teaching them*. The firſt of theſe, *Inſtruct all nations*, is certainly too vague and indefinite. If *to inſtruct* and *to teach* be not here entirely ſynonymous, their ſignifications are ſo nearly coincident, that were they, in theſe two verſes, to change places, it would not make a ſenſible difference on the meaning. Wy. in ſaying *Make diſciples*, has hit exactly the ſenſe of μαθητευω, but it is one thing *to make diſciples in all nations*, and another thing *to make all nations diſciples*. Wa. does better in this reſpect. Sc. and Wel. intended well, but there is no ſuch verb as *to diſciple* in the language. It is found, indeed, in Spenſer, who affected obſolete words; but he uſes it in a very different ſenſe; for with him it is *to puniſh*, or to treat with ſevere diſcipline. The verſion which Dod. has given of this paſſage appears the leaſt exceptionable. But the verb *to proſelyte*, though ſometimes occurring, is ſo far from being in common uſe, and has ſo much the appearance of a learned or technical term, that, in a ſtyle ſo natural and familiar as that of the Evangeliſts, we ought not, without neceſſity, to recur to it. But there can be no neceſſity here, as the verb *to convert*, applied as in this paſſage, has preciſely the ſame meaning. See the note on ch. xviii. 3.

[2] *The concluſion of this ſtate*, της συντελειας του αιωνος. Ch. xii. 32. N.

[3] The *amen*, with which this Goſpel concludes, is wanting in four MSS. and in the Vul. Cop and Arm. verſions.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MARK.

For the title, see the note on the title of the preceding Gospel.

CHAP. I.

1. *THE beginning of the Gospel.* Some consider αρχη here as the nominative to the verb εγενετο, v. 4. and include the quotations from the Prophets, verses 2d and 3d, in a parenthesis. But abstracting from the awkwardness of so long a suspension of the sense in the very first sentence, the expression αρχη του ευαγγελιου εγενετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων appears, nowise agreeable to the style of the sacred writers; whereas εγενετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων, *John came baptising*, or simply, *John baptised*, is quite in their idiom. See ch. ix. 7. L. ix. 35. The first verse, therefore, ought to be understood as a sentence by itself. It was not unusual with authors to prefix to their performance a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately follows. See Hos. i. 1, 2. In this manner also Herodotus introduces his history, Ηροδοτου Αλικαρνασσεος ιστοριης αποδεξις ωδε. This usage, probably, gave rise to the custom afterwards adopted by transcribers, of putting, at the head of their transcript, *incipit*, followed by the name of the book or subject, and subjoining at the foot, *explicit*, with the name repeated, as a testimony to the reader, that the work was entire. This purpose it was with them the better fitted for answering, as the whole book was commonly written on one large and continued scroll, hence called a volume, and not as with us, on a number of distinct leaves. So far, however, the custom obtains still, that we always prefix a short title on the page, where we begin, and subjoin *The end*, on the page where the work is concluded.

2. *Son of God*, υιου του Θεου. As brevity is often studied in titles, the article before υιου is probably, on that account, left out. Let it be noted, in general, that the omission of the article in Gr. is not like the insertion of the indefinite article in Eng. a positive expression that the word is to be understood indefinitely. The phrase υιος του Θεου, as was hinted before (Mt. xxvii. 54. N.), exactly corresponds to the Eng. *Son of God*, which leaves the reader at liberty to understand *son* definitely, or indefinitely, as he thinks proper. The term *God's Son* answers the same purpose; but though well adapted to the familiarity of dialogue, it does not always suit the dignity of historical narration. Mt. xiv. 33. N.

2. *In the prophets*, εν τοις προφηταις. Such is the common reading. But it ought not to be dissembled, that six MSS. two of them of considerable note, some ancient versions, amongst which are the Vul. and the Sy. and several ecclesiastical writers read, *in the prophet Isaiah*. As the common reading, however, has an immense majority of copies in its favour, and some noted translations, such as the Ara. and the Eth. as it is more conformable to the scope of the place, where two quotations are brought from different prophets, and the nearest is not from Isaiah, but from Malachi, I could discover no good reason for departing from the received reading.

2. *Angel.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

3. *In the wilderness*, εν τη ερημω. It is called, in Mt. iii. 1. *the wildern's of Judea*, which is mentioned Jud. i. 16. and in the title of Ps. lxiii. It lay east from Jerusalem.

Jeruſalem, along the Jordan, and the lake *Aſphaltites*, alſo called *the Dead Sea*. By *wilderneſs* in Scripture, it is plain that we are not always to underſtand, what is commonly denominated ſo with us, a region either uninhabitable or uninhabited. No more ſeems to have been denoted by it than a country fitter for paſture than for agriculture, mountainous, woody, and but thinly inhabited. Lightfoot has well obſerved, that theſe ερημοι did not want their towns and villages. The name appears to me to be of much the ſame import with our word *highlands*.

4. *Publiſhing*. Diſſ. VI. P. V.—[2] *Reformation*. Ib. P. III.

10. *The Spirit deſcend upon him*, το πνευμα καταβαινον επ' αυτον. Vul. *Spiritum deſcendentem et manentem in ipſo*. So alſo the Sax. Agreeably to this, we find, in four Gr. MSS. of little account, και μενον inſerted, which is all the authority now known.

13. *Forty days*, ημερας τεσσαρακοντα. The Vul. adds, *et quadraginta noctibus*. Three Gr. MSS. have και νυκτας τεσσαρακοντα. Conformable to which are alſo the Ara. Cop. Sax. and Eth. verſions.

14. *Good tidings*. Diſſ. V. P. II.—[2] *Reign*. Ib. P. I.

15. *The time is accompliſhed*, οτι πεπληρωται ο καιρος. E. T. *The time is fulfilled*. The time here ſpoken of is that which, according to the predictions of the prophets, was to intervene between their days, or between any period aſſigned by them, and the appearance of the Meſſiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as conſiſting of what, in prophetic language, is denominated ſeventy weeks, that is (every week being ſeven years) four hundred and ninety years; reckoning from the order iſſued to rebuild the temple of Jeruſalem. However much the Jews miſunderſtood many of the other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary perſonage; what concerned both the time and the place of his firſt appearance, ſeems to have been pretty well apprehended by the bulk of the nation. From the N. T. as well as from the other accounts of that period ſtill extant, it is evident that the expectation of this great deliverer was then general among them. It is a point of ſome conſequence to the cauſe of Chriſtianity, that both the time and the place of our Lord's birth coincided with the interpretations then commonly given of the prophecies, by the Jews themſelves, his contemporaries.

19. *Mending*, καταρτιζοντας. The Gr. word not only ſignifies *to mend*, or *refit*, but alſo *to prepare*, *to make*. Interpreters have generally preferred here the firſt ſignification. This concurrence itſelf, where the choice is indifferent, is a good ground of preference to later interpreters. But I do not think the choice in this paſſage indifferent. A fiſhing bark, ſuch as Joſephus deſcribes thoſe on this lake to have been (lib. ii. ca. 43. *De bello*), though an improper place for manufacturing nets in, might be commodious enough for repairing ſmall injuries ſuſtained in uſing.

24. *Art thou come to deſtroy us?* Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) obſerves, that the Jews had a tradition that the Meſſiah would deſtroy Galilee, and diſperſe the Galileans. He thinks, therefore, that this ought to be conſidered as ſpoken by the man, who was a Galilean, and not by the demon, as it is commonly underſtood.

[2] *The holy One of God*. Diſſ. VI. P. IV. L. iv. §4. N.

28. *Through all the region of Galilee*, εις ολην την περιχωρον της Γαλιλαιας. E. T. *Throughout all the region round about Galilee*. Vul. *In omnem regionem Galilææ*. This verſion of the old La. interpreter entirely expreſſes the ſenſe, and is every way better than that given by Be. *In totam regionem circumjacentem Galilææ*, who has been imitated by other tranſlators, both in La. and in modern languages, often through a ſilly attempt at expreſſing the etymology of the Gr. words. Had Galilee been the name of a town, περιχωρος muſt no doubt have meant the *environs*, or circumjacent country. But as Galilee is the name of a conſiderable extent of country, the compound περιχωρος denotes no more than the ſimple χωρος, or, if there be a difference, it only adds a ſuggeſtion that the country ſpoken of is extenſive. But as *the region round about Galilee* muſt be different from Galilee itſelf, or, which is the ſame thing, *the region of Galilee*, the tranſlators that render it ſo, totally alter the ſenſe. The uſe of περιχωρος in the Sep. manifeſtly ſupports the interpretation which, after the Vul. and all the ancient interpreters, I have given. Η περιχωρος Αργους is with us *the region of Argob*; η περιχωρος του Ιορδανου, *the plain of Jordan*. Other examples might be given, if it were neceſſary. To expreſs properly in Gr. *the region round about Galilee*, we ſhould ſay, η περιχωρος, not της Γαλιλαιας, but περι την Γαλιλαιαν, the repetition of the prepoſition being quite agreeable to the genius of the tongue. Thus, Apoc. xv. 6. Περιεζωσμενοι περι τα ſτηθη. There is no occaſion, therefore, for Dr. Pearce's correction, "rather into the "whole region of Galilee, which was round about, *i. e.* "about Capernaum;" a comment which is, beſides, liable to this other objection, that, if the lake of Genneſaret was, as is commonly ſuppoſed, the boundary of Galilee on the eaſt it would not be true that Capernaum, which was ſituated on the ſide of the lake, was ſurrounded by Galilee.

43. *Strictly charging him*, εμβριμησαμενος αυτω. Mt. ix. 30. [2] N.

44. *To the prieſt*, τω ιερει. Vul. *Principi ſacerdotum*. Two ordinary Gr. MSS. have τω αρχιερει. The Sax. alſo follows the Vul. This is all the collateral evidence I know, which can be produced for the reading of the

Vul. Wet. adds the Go. version. But if I can trust to the Go. and Anglo-Saxon versions, published by Junius and Mareschal, Amsterdam 1684, the Go. is here entirely agreeable to the common Gr. Indeed there is every kind of evidence, external and internal, against this reading of the Vul. The power of judging in all such cases belonged by law equally to every priest. The addition of the article τω, in this passage, appears to have arisen from this circumstance, that, during the attendance of every course, each priest of the course had his special business assigned him by lot. One, in particular, would have it in charge to inspect the leprous and unclean, and to give orders with regard to their cleansing. For this reason it is said *the priest*, not *a priest*; but we have reason to think that, except in extraordinary cases, *the high priest* would not be called upon to decide in a matter which the law had put in the power of the meanest of the order. The Sy. uses the plural number to *the priests*.

CHAP. II.

2. *The word of God*, τον λογον. L. i. 2. N.

7. *Blasphemies*. Diss. X. P. II. § 14.

8. *Jesus knowing in himself*, επιγνους ὁ Ιησους τω πνευματι αυτου. E. T. *When Jesus perceived in his Spirit*. There is something particular in the expression of the Evangelist. At first, it would appear applicable only to the perception a man has of what passes within his own mind, when the object of his thought is his own faculties and their operations. This species of knowledge we commonly distinguish by the name *consciousness*. But this is far from suiting the application of the phrase here, where the thing perceived was what passed in the minds of others. To me it appears manifest, that the intention of the sacred writer was to signify that our Lord, in this case, did not, as others, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and outward methods of discovery, which are open to all men, but from peculiar powers he possessed independently of every thing external. I have, therefore, preferred to every other, the simple expression *knowing in himself*; both because *perceiving in*, or *by*, *his Spirit*, has some ambiguity in it, and because the phrases η ψυχη αυτου and το πνευμα αυτου often, in the Jewish idiom, denote *himself*. May it not be reasonably concluded, that the information, as to the source of this knowledge in Jesus, is here given by the sacred writer to teach all Christians, to the end of the world, that they are not to think themselves warranted, by the example of their Lord, to pronounce on what passes within the hearts of others, inasmuch as this is a branch of knowledge which was peculiar to the Son of God, whose special prerogative it was, not to need that any should testify concerning man unto him, as of himself he knew what was in man.

15. *Placed themselves at table*. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

17. [*To reformation*], εις μετανοιαν. This clause is wanting here in a greater number of MSS. and ancient versions than in Mt. ix. 13. (See note 3d on that verse.) It is rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. It is not improbable that it has originally, by some copist who has thought the expression defective without it, been borrowed from L. v. 32. about which there is no diversity of reading. But though there may be some ground to doubt of its authenticity in this place, and in that above quoted from Mt. yet, as there can be no doubt of its appositeness, I thought it better to retain it in both places, and distinguish it as of doubtful authority.

18. *Those of the Pharisees*, οι των Φαρισαιων. In a considerable number of MSS. (some very valuable) we read οι Φαρισαιοι. The Vul. has *Pharisæi*, not *discipuli Pharisæorum*. This is also the reading of the Cop. Go. Sax. and second Sy. versions. But they are not all a sufficient counterpoise to the evidence we have for the common reading.

19. *The bridemen*, οι υιοι τ̃ νυμφωνος. E. T. *The children of the bride chamber*. It is evident that the Gr. phrase οι υιοι τ̃ νυμφωνος denotes no more than the Eng. word *bridemen* does, namely the young men who, at a marriage, are attendants on the bride and bridegroom; whereas, the phrase in Eng. *the children of the bride chamber*, suggests a very different idea.

20. *Do they fast?* μη δυνανται νηστευειν; E. T. *Can they fast?* In a subject such as this, relating to the ordinary manners or customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of any thing, which is never done, as of what cannot be done; because it cannot, with propriety, or without the ridicule of singularity, be done. Μη δυνανται νηστευειν is therefore synonymous with μη νηστευουσι; *Do they fast?* And ου δυνανται νηστευειν, with ου νηστευουσι, *They do not fast*. As the simple manner suits better the idiom of our tongue, I have preferred it.

20. *They will fast*, νηστευσουσιν. E. T. *Shall they fast*. The expression here used does not convey a command from our Lord to his disciples, but is merely a declaration made by him occasionally to others, of what would in fact happen, or what a sense of propriety, on a change of circumstances, would induce his disciples, of themselves, to do. The import is therefore better expressed by *will* than by *shall*. At the time when the common translation was made, the use of these auxiliary verbs did not entirely coincide with the present use. In the solemn style, and especially in all prophecies and predictions, *shall* was constantly used where every body, now speaking in prose, would say, *will*. As that manner is (except in Scotland) become obsolete; and as, on many occasions, the modern use serves better the purpose of perspicuity, distinguishing mere declarations from commands, promises, and threats; I judged it better, in all such cases, to employ these terms according to the idiom which prevails at present.

24. *Which on the Sabbath it is unlawful to do.* Mt. xii. 2. N.

26. *Abiather the high prieſt.* From the paſſage in the hiſtory referred to, it appears that Ahimelech, the father of Abiather, was then the high prieſt.

3. *The tabernacle—the loaves of the preſence.* Mt. xii. 4. N.

28. *Therefore the Son of Man,* ὡστε ὁ υἱος του ανθρωπου. This is introduced as a conſequence from what had been advanced, v. 27. *The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.* Hence one would conclude, that *the Son of Man* in this verſe muſt be equivalent to *man* in the preceding; otherwiſe a term is introduced into the concluſion which was not in the premiſes.

CHAP. III.

4. *To do good—or to do evil; to ſave, or to kill—* αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι· ψυχην σωσαι, η αποκτειναι In the ſtyle of Scripture, the mere negation of any thing is often expreſſed by the affirmation of the contrary. Thus, L. xiv. 26. *not to love,* or even to love leſs, is called *to hate;* Mt. xi. 25. *not to reveal* is *to hide;* and here, *not to do good,* when we can, is *to do evil; not to ſave* is *to kill.* Without obſerving this particularity in the Oriental idiom (of which many more examples might be brought), we ſhould be at a loſs to diſcover the pertinency of our Lord's argument; as the queſtion about preference here was ſolely between *doing* and *not doing.* But from this, and many other paſſages, it may be juſtly deduced, as a ſtanding principle of the Chriſtian ethics, that not to do the good which we have the opportunity and power to do, is, in a certain degree the ſame as to do the contrary evil; and not to prevent miſchief, when we can, the ſame as to commit it.

5. *For the blindneſs of their minds,* επι τη πωρωσει της καρδιας αυτων. Diſſ. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

12. *He ſtrictly charged them,* πολλα επετιμα αυτοις. Ch. ix. 25. N.

14. *That he might commiſſion them to proclaim the reign,* ινα αποστελλη αυτους κηρυσσειν. Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 2.

21. *His kinſmen hearing this, went out,* ακουσαντες οι παρ' αυτου εξηλθον. Sir Norton Knatchbul, a learned man, but a hardy critic, explains theſe words as if they were arranged and pointed thus, Οι ακουσαντες, παρ' αυτου εξηλθον, "Qui audiverunt, ſive audientes quod turba ita "fureret, ab eo exiverunt," *They who heard, went out from him.* He does not plead any diverſity of reading, but that ſuch tranſpoſitions of the article, are often to be met with. "Ακουσαντες οι dicitur frequenti trajectio- "ne pro οι ακουσαντες." But it would have been more ſatisfactory to produce examples. For my part, I cannot help thinking, with Raphelius, that this tranſpoſition is very harſh, and but ill ſuited to the idiom of the language.

21. Οι παρ' αυτου. That this is a common phraſe for denoting, *ſui, propinqui, cognati,* his kinſmen, his friends, is well known. I have preferred *kinſmen,* as the circumſtances of the ſtory evince, that it is not his diſciples who are meant, but who would moſt readily be underſtood by the appellation *friends.* Biſhop Pearce is of a different opinion, and thinks that by οι παρ' αυτου is meant "rather theſe who were with him, or about "him, that is, ſome of the Apoſtles or others preſent." Of the ſame opinion is Dr. M'Night. But I cannot find a warrant for this interpretation. Παρα often ſignifies *ad, apud, juxta, prope; at, near, with;* but not when joined with the genitive. It has, in that ſignification, regularly the dative of perſons, and the accuſative of things. Thus, Phavorinus, Παρα προθεσις, οτε πλησιοτητα δηλοι, επι μεν εμψυχα, δοτικην συντασσεται· επι δε αψυχα, αιτιατικην. He ſubjoins only three exceptions that have occurred to him, in all which the prepoſition has the accuſative of the perſon, inſtead of the dative, but not a ſingle example wherein it is conſtrued with the genitive. The uſe of the prepoſition in the N. T. in this ſignification, which is very frequent, I have found, except in one inſtance, where the dative of the thing, and not the accuſative, is uſed, entirely conformable to the remark of the lexicographer. The inſtance is in J. xix. 25. Ειστηκεισαν δε παρα τω σταυρω. But in no inſtance have I found it with a genitive, unleſs when the meaning is different; when it has either no relation to place, as appears to be the caſe here, or when it correſponds to the La. *a, ab,* and to the Eng. *from.* If the article did not form an inſuperable objection to the diſpoſition of the words propoſed by Knatchbul, his way of rendering παρ' αυτου εξηλθον, *went out from him,* would be unexceptionable. Another inſuperable objection againſt both the above hypotheſes (for both imply that it was ſome of the diſciples, or at leaſt ſome of thoſe who were with Jeſus in the houſe, that went out), is that, by the Evangeliſt's account, they who went out were perſons who had been informed of his ſituation by others. Ακουσαντες οι παρ' αυτου. Now, what writer of common ſenſe would ſpeak of men's hearing of a diſtreſs which they had ſeen and felt, and in which they had been partakers? For it is ſaid not of him alone, but of him and his diſciples, that they were ſo crowded, that they could not ſo much as eat. Nor can the participle ακουσαντες, in a conſiſtency with the ordinary rules of conſtruction, refer to any thing but the diſtreſs mentioned in the preceding verſe.

31. *To lay hold of him,* κρατησαι αυτου. All the abovementioned critics agree in thinking that the αυτου refers not to Ιησους, but to οχλος, in the twentieth verſe. L. Cl. alſo, has adopted this opinion. He renders the words κρατησαι αυτου, *pour la retenir,* referring to *la multitude,* in the foregoing verſe. As to the juſtneſs of this verſion, far from being dogmatical, he ſays, modeſtly enough, in his notes, *Les mots* κρατησαι αυτου *ſont equivoques, et peuvent être egalement rapportez au mot* οχλος *qui precede, et à Jeſus Chriſt. Si l'on ſuit cette conſtruction, l'Evangeliſte voudra dire—mais ſi on rapporte ces paroles à Jeſus Chriſt, il leur faudra donner un ſens conforme—* He ſeems

ſeems to put both ways of rendering the words on a foot of equality. Biſhop Pearce is more poſitive, and ſays, in his note on this paſſage, our Eng. tranſlation muſt certainly be a miſtake. Why? Becauſe Jeſus was in a houſe, and therefore they who wanted to lay hold on him, could not go out for that purpoſe. True, they could not go out of that houſe; but if they who heard of his diſtreſs were in another houſe (and the very expreſſion employed by the Evangeliſt, ſhows that they were not witneſſes of the diſtreſs), would there be any impropriety in ſaying, *They went out to lay hold on him?* I admit, with L. Cl. that the pronoun αυτοι, may refer either to οχλος, or to Jeſus, the ſubject of diſcourſe. But that the latter is the antecedent here, is the more probable of the two ſuppoſitions, for this reaſon: The ſame pronoun occurs before, in this verſe, where it is admitted, by every body, to refer to *him*, and not to *the multitude*, οι παρ' αυτω εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον. The interpretation, therefore, which makes it refer to *him*, though not abſolutely neceſſary, is the moſt obvious, and the moſt conformable to the ſyntactic order. Further, till of late, the pronoun here has been invariably underſtood ſo by interpreters. Thus, the Vul. *Cum audiſſent ſui, exierunt tenere eum.* It muſt have been *eam*, if they had underſtood it of the crowd, *turba*, mentioned in the preceding ſentence. With this agree, in ſenſe, all the other tranſlations I know, ancient or modern, Oriental or European, L. Cl.'s alone excepted. The ancient commentators, Gr. and La. ſhow not only that they underſtood the expreſſion in the ſame way, but that they never heard of any other interpretation. Though, in matters of abſtract reaſoning, I am far from paying great deference to names and authorities, their judgment is often juſtly held deciſive in matters purely grammatical.

41. *He is beſide himſelf*, εξεση. Vul. *In furorem verſus eſt.* It ſhocks many perſons to think, that ſo harſh, ſo indecent, a ſentence concerning our Lord, ſhould have been pronounced by his relations. Several methods have, accordingly, been attempted, for eluding this ſentiment entirely, at leaſt affixing another meaning to the word εξεση, than that here given, though the moſt ancient and the moſt common. By the explanation Dr. Pearce had given of the preceding words which I have aſſigned my reaſons for rejecting), he has avoided the difficulty altogether; what is affirmed being underſtood, by him, as ſpoken of the crowd, and not of Jeſus. But he has not adverted, that to give the words this turn, is to render the whole paſſage incoherent. Nothing appears plainer, than that the verdict of his friends, in this verſe, is the occaſion of introducing the verdict of the Scribes in that immediately following. Obſerve the parallelism (If I may be allowed the term) of the expreſſions: Οι παρ' αυτου εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον, ελεγον γαρ οτι εξεση· και οι γραμματεις οι απο Ιεροσολυμων καταβαντες ελεγον οτι Βεελζεβουλ εχει. Were the Scribes alſo ſpeaking of the crowd? As that will not be pretended; to ſuppoſe that in one verſe the crowd is ſpoken of, and in the next our Lord, though the expreſſion is ſimilar, and no hint given of the change of the ſubject, is, to ſay the leaſt, a very arbitrary ſuppoſition. Now, that the ſenſe given in the common verſion, which I have followed, is an ordinary meaning of the word, is not denied. Phavorinus explains it by μαινεται, and in 2 Cor. v. 13. it is contraſted with the verb σωφρονειν, in ſuch a manner as not to admit another interpretation. Thus: Ειτε γαρ εξιστημι, Θεω· ειτε σωφρονουμεν ὑμιν. It is urged, on the other ſide, that the word occurs in the Sep. in a different meaning, Gen. xlv. 26. εξεση η διανοια αυτου. Et T. *Jacob's heart fainted.* But paſſing the obſervation, that the expreſſion is not entirely the ſame, I ſhould admit the ſame to be the meaning of the Evangeliſt, if it were mentioned as what was reported to his friends, and not as what was ſaid by them. When they ſay, *he is beſide himſelf*, every body underſtands it as a concluſion which they infer on the ſudden, from what they had heard. The judgment is raſh and injurious, but not unnatural to people in a certain temper. The other verſion, *he has fainted*, denoting a viſible event, could not naturally come from thoſe who knew nothing of what had happened, but by information from others. If it had been ſaid, in the future, εκστησεται, *he will faint*, the caſe had been different, as this would have been no more than an expreſſion of their fears. L. Cl. was ſo ſenſible of the weight of the above mentioned objections, that, though he conſidered the pronoun αυτον as relating to the crowd, he could not underſtand οτι εξεση, which he renders, *qu'il etoit tombé en defaillance*, as either ſpoken of the crowd, or as ſpoken by the friends: but, in order to keep clear of both theſe difficulties, he has, after Gro. adopted an hypotheſis which, if poſſible, is ſtill more exceptionable. He ſuppoſes, in contradiction to all appearances, that the word ελεγον in this verſe, is uſed imperſonally or indefinitely, and that the ſame word, in the next verſe, ſo ſimilarly introduced, is uſed perſonally or definitely. Accordingly, he tranſlates ελεγον γαρ, not *car ils diſoient*, as the conſtruction of the words requires, but *car on diſoit*, thus making it not what his kinſmen inferred, but what was reported to them. If this had actually been the caſe, the ſimple, obvious, and proper, expreſſion in Gr. would have been: Ακουσαντες οι παρ' αυτου οτι εξεστηκεν, εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον. In this caſe, alſo, I ſhould have thought it not improbable that the word implied no more than thoſe writers ſuppoſe, namely, that he had fainted. Some are for rendering it, *he wondered*, or *was amazed*, aſſigning to it the ſame meaning which the word has ch. ii. 12. where an evident ſubject of wonder and amazement is firſt mentioned, and then the paſſion, as the natural effect. This way of rendering the words is expoſed to objections equally ſtrong, and more obvious, The only modern Eng. verſions, that I know, which follow the common tranſlation, are Hey. and Weſ. Gro. thinks that the Sy. and Ara. favour his explanation of the word εξεση. But Father Si. is of a different opinion. I cannot help obſerving, on the whole, that in the way the verſe is here rendered, no ſignification is aſſigned to the words, which it is not univerſally allowed they frequently bear;

no force is put upon the conſtruction, but every thing interpreted in the manner which would moſt readily occur to a reader of common underſtanding, who, without any preconceived opinion, entered on the ſtudy. On the contrary, there is none of the other interpretations which does not (as has been ſhown) offer ſome violence to the words, or to the ſyntax; in conſequence of which, the ſenſe extracted, is far from being that which would moſt readily preſent itſelf to an unprejudiced reader. It hardly admits a doubt, that the only thing which has hindered the univerſal concurrence of tranſlators, in the common verſion, is the unfavourable light it puts our Lord's relations in. But that their diſpoſition was, at leaſt, not always favourable to his claims, we have the beſt authority for aſſerting. See J. vii. 5. with the context.

I ſhall conclude this long critique on the whole paſſage, with taking notice of a different reading on the firſt part of it. The Cam. (with which concur two verſions, the Go. and the Cop.) ſubſtitutes ὁτι ἠκουσαν περι αυτω οἱ γραμματεις και οἱ λοιποι, *when the Scribes and the reſt heard concerning him*, for ἀκουσαντες οἱ παρ' αυτω. Had this reading been ſufficiently ſupported (which is far from being the caſe), I ſhould have gladly adopted it, and ſaved the relations.

26. *Eternal puniſhment.* Ch. xii. 40. N.

CHAP. IV.

10. *Thoſe who were about him, with the twelve, aſked him,* ἠρωτησαν αυτον οἱ περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα. Vul. *Interrogaverunt eum hi qui cum eo erant duodecim.* In conformity to the import, though not to the letter, of this reading, four Gr. MSS. of which the Cam. is one, inſtead of οἱ περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα, read οἱ μαθηται αυτω. This is all the countenance which the reading adopted by the Vul. has from antiquity.

24. *To you who are attentive,* ὑμιν τοις ακουουσιν. E. T. *Unto you that hear.* The places are numberleſs, wherein the Heb. שמע *ſhamang*, and the Gr. ακουω, ſignify not barely *to hear*, but *to be attentive*, to ſhow regard to what one hears. See, amongſt other paſſages, Mt. xviii. 15, 16. That it muſt be underſtood with this limitation here, is evident from its being preceded by the warning, βλεπετε τι ακουετε, and from its being followed by the words ὁς γαρ αν εχῃ— where the phraſes, *to have*, and *not to have*, are, on all ſides, allowed to mean, in the firſt inſtance, to make, and not to make, a good uſe of what one has; and, in the ſecond, barely to poſſeſs, and not to poſſeſs. It may be proper to add, that in ſome noted MSS. the words τοις ακουουσιν are wanting; as well as in the Vul. Cop. and Ara. verſions.

25. *From him who hath not, even that which he hath, ſhall be taken.* See the preceding N. *That which he hath*, in the laſt clauſe, is what he is poſſeſſed of. I did not think it proper to interpret the word differently, according to its different ſenſes, becauſe there is, here, an intended paronomaſia. Mt. x. 39. N.

36. *Having him in the bark, they ſet ſail,* παραλαμβανουσιν αυτον, ὡς ην εν τω πλοιω. E. T. *They took him, even as he was, in the ſhip.* The Vul. *Aſſumunt eum ita ut erat in navi.* The word *ita, even*, has not any thing in the original correſponding to it, and does not ſerve to illuſtrate the ſenſe. With the Vul. agree moſt modern verſions. L. Cl. indeed ſays, *Ils, le prirent dans leur barque*, but has overlooked the ὡς ην entirely. Raphelius ſeems to underſtand the paſſage in the ſame way that L. Cl. does, and explains ὡς ην, *with ſuch preparation as he had*, putting the comma after ην, and not after αυτον. With Elſner, I approve more the common interpretation. Againſt the other, there are three principal objections: 1ſt, The words are not εις το πλοιον, but εν τω πλοιω. 2dly, No example of ὡς ην, in their acceptation, has been yet produced. To give, as an example, ὡσπερ ἐξυπνισασμενος ην, is too ridiculous to require an anſwer. Nor is it more to the purpoſe, to quote phraſes ſo different as ὡς ειχεν and ὡς ετυχεν. 3dly, It does not ſuit the humble manner in which our Lord travelled at all times. He never affected the ſtate of a great man; nor do we ever hear of ſervants, horſes, or waggons, attending him with proviſions. Dr. Pearce, who ſeems to favour that way of rendering the words, was ſenſible of this incongruity, and therefore explains it, *tired as he was;* but this ſtill ſuppoſes ſuch an elliptis in the expreſſion as I can find no example of.

39. *Commanded the wind.* Ch. ix. 25. N.

CHAP. V.

3. *In the tombs,* εν τοις μνημειοις. In a very great number of MSS. amongſt which are all the oldeſt and the beſt, it is εν τοις μνημασι. The Com. and Ben. read ſo. This is one of thoſe diverſities concerning which, as the ſenſe is not affected, we can conclude nothing from tranſlations. I agree with Mill and Wet. in adopting it, and have, therefore, though of little conſequence, rendered it *tombs*, as I commonly uſe *monument* in tranſlating μνημειον.

7. *I conjure thee,* ὁρκιζω σε. E. T. *I adjure thee.* It was obſerved, on Mt. xxvi. 63. that the verbs ὁρκιζειν and ἐξορκιζειν, when ſpoken of as uſed by magiſtrates, or thoſe in authority, denote to *adjure;* that is, to oblige to ſwear, to exact an oath; but when it is mentioned as uſed by others, and on ordinary occaſions, it is better rendered to *conjure*, or to obteſt ſolemnly.

11. *The mountain,* τα ορη. There is ſo great a concurrence of the moſt valuable MSS. early editions, Fathers, and ancient verſions, in favour of τω ορει, in the ſingular, that it is hardly poſſible to queſtion its authenticity.

Fathers, and ancient verſions, in favour of τω ορει, in the ſingular, that it is hardly poſſible to queſtion its authenticity. The ancient tranſlations which corroborate this reading, are all thoſe that are of any account with critics, the Vul. both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. Gro. Mill, and Wet. receive it.

15. *Him who had been poſſeſſed by the legion,* τον δαιμονιζομενον—τον εσχηκοτα τον λεγιωνα. The latter clauſe is not in the Cam. and ſeems not to have been read by the author of the Vul. who ſays, *Illum qui a dæmonio vexabatur.* Neither is it in the Sax.

23. *I pray thee come, and lay thy hands upon her,* ινα ελθων επιθης αυτη τας χειρας. Vul. *Veni, impone manum ſuper eum.* Perhaps the La. verſion of the words has ariſen from a different reading in the original. The Cam. with other differences, has ελθε in the imperative. Perhaps it has been what the La. tranſlator thought a proper expreſſion of the ſenſe. The conjunction ινα, with the ſubjunctive mood, not preceded by another verb, is juſtly to be regarded as another form of the imperative. The only difference between it and an ordinary imperative is, that it is a more humble expreſſion, ſerving to diſcriminate an entreaty from a command. In this reſpect it correſponds to the Heb. particle נא *na*, which, when it is ſubjoined to the imperative, forms, in effect, a different mood; for what two things can differ farther than *to entreat* and *to command?* Yet, to mark the difference in moſt languages, can be effected only by ſome ſuch phraſe as, *I pray thee;* which, therefore, ought not to be conſidered as words inſerted without authority from the original, ſince without them the full import of the original is not expreſſed. It has, accordingly, been ſupplied in ſome ſuch way in moſt verſions. Be. ſays, *Rogo;* Er. Zu. and Cal. *Oro;* Dio. *Deh;* G. F. *Je te prie;* Beau. *Je vous prie.* The ſame may be affirmed, not only of our common verſion, but of the generality of Eng. tranſlations. This remark will ſuperſede the correction propoſed by Dr. Pearce, which, though not implauſible, leans too much on conjecture to be adopted here.

CHAP. VI.

9. *To be ſhod with ſandals, and not to put on two coats.* The reading, in Gr. here followed, is, Αλλ' υποδεδεμενους σανδαλια, και μη ενδυσασθαι δυο χιτωνας. Authorities are almoſt equally divided between ενδυσασθαι in the infinitive, and ενδυσησθε in the imperative; for I conſider, with Biſhop Pearce, thoſe copies which read ενδυσασθε as favouring the former, the change of the termination αι into ε being a common blunder of tranſcribers. Now, though the authorities on the other ſide were more numerous than they are, the ſenſe and ſtructure of the diſcourſe are more than ſufficient to turn the balance. Mr. had hitherto been uſing the oblique, not the direct, ſtyle, in the injunctions which he reports as given by our Lord. This verſe, therefore, is moſt naturally conſtrued with παρηγγειλεν αυτοις in the preceding verſe. It is not uſual with this writer to paſs, abruptly, from the ſtyle of narration, to that of dialogue, without giving notice to the reader. It is the more improbable here, as intimation is formally given in the next verſe, in regard to what follows; και ελεγεν αυτοις. For, if this notice was unneceſſary, when he firſt adopted the change of manner, it was unſeaſonable afterwards, as it hurt both the ſimplicity and the perſpicuity of the diſcourſe. I cannot help, therefore, in this inſtance, differing from both the late critical editors Mill and Wet.

11. *Verily I ſay unto you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrah ſhall be more tolerable on the day of judgment, than the condition of that city.* The Gr. anſwering to this, Αμην λεγω υμιν, ανεκτοτερον κ. τ. λ. is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. The Vul. Sax. and Cop. alſo, have nothing that correſponds to it.

15. *It is a prophet like thoſe of ancient times,* οτι προφητης εστιν, η ως εις των προφητων. E. T. *That it is a propket, or as one of the Prophets.* There is, however, ſuch a conſent of MSS. ſeveral of them of the firſt note, verſions, as Vul. Sy. Ara. Go. Cop. Sax. and Eth. with editions, Fathers, critics, for rejecting the conjunction η, as to remove all doubt concerning it. The ſentence is alſo more perſpicuous without it. Οι προφηται, uſed in this manner, always meant the ancient Prophets, Iſaiah, Jeremiah—

20. *Protected,* συνετηρει. E. T. *Obſerved.* On the margin we read *kept* or *ſaved him,* to wit, from the effects of Herodias' reſentment. This is evidently the true verſion. The Vul has *cuſtodiebat;* Ar. in the ſame ſenſe, *conſervabat;* Er. and the other La. tranſlators, leſs properly, *obſervabat.* That the import of the verb is *to preſerve, to protect,* appears not only from the connection in this place, but from all the other paſſages in the N. T. where it occurs. Mt. ix. 17. L. ii. 19. v. 38.

20. *Did many things recommended by him,* ακουας αυτου, πολλα εποιει. That Herod attended with pleaſure on John's teaching, we are told, in the very next clauſe of the ſentence, ηδεως αυτου ηκουε. As this ought not to be conſidered as a tautology, the former ακουας αυτου muſt be regarded only as explanatory of πολλα εποιει, the import of which I have given in the tranſlation.

26. *Diſpatched a ſentinel,* αποστειλας σπεκουλατορα. E. T. *Sent an executioner.* The word *executioner,* with us, means one whoſe office it is to execute the ſentence of the law on criminals. They had not then a peculiar officer for this buſineſs. The lictors, indeed, were employed in it by thoſe Roman magiſtrates who were entitled to their attendance. Other perſons in authority in the provinces, commonly entruſted it to ſome of the ſoldiery. The term uſed by Mr. is a La. word, and properly ſignifies *ſentinel,* watch or ſcout.

33. *Many, who ſaw them depart, and knew whither they were ſailing, ran out of all the cities, got thither by land before them,* ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας οι οχλοι, και επεγνωσαν αυτον πολλοι, και πεζη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει, και προηλθον αυτους. E. T. *The people ſaw them departing, and many knew him, and ran a-foot thither out of all cities, and outwent them.* There are two various readings of ſome moment on this paſſage. The firſt is, the omiſſion of ὁ οχλος, the ſecond, the omiſſion of αυτον. The authorities for both are not equal, but are, all things conſidered, ſufficient ground for adopting them. As to the firſt, it is ſupported by more MSS. editions, Fathers, and critics, than neceſſary; as to the ſecond, the rejection of the pronoun is warranted by the Cam. and ſeveral other MSS. as well as by the Vul. which renders the words thus: *Viderunt eos abeuntes, et cognoverunt multi; et pedeſtres de omnibus civitatibus concurrerunt illuc, et prævenerunt eos.* But what I think a ſuperior warrant, and a kind of intrinſic evidence, that the words in queſtion are intruders, is, that the ſenſe, as well as the conſtruction (which ſeemed embarraſſed before), is cleared by their removal. It could not, probably, be in the ſight of the multitude that our Lord and his Apoſtles would embark, ſince their intention was to be private, though many might diſcover it, who would inform others. That the hiſtorian ſhould ſay that many knew him, now after he had been ſo long occupied every day in teaching them, and curing their ſick, and had been conſtantly attended by the admiring crowd, is exceedingly improbable. There would be, comparatively, but few there who did not know him. It may be ſaid, indeed, that when the αυτον is excluded, there ſeems to be ſome defect, as it is not expreſsly ſaid what they knew: but this is ſo fully ſupplied by the following words, which acquaint us that the people got thither before them, as to put it beyond a doubt, that what he meant to ſay they knew, was the place whither our Lord and his diſciples intended to ſail.

2. *By land.* Mt. xiv. 13. N.

3. *And came together to him,* και συνηλθον προς αυτον. This clauſe is wanting in three MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop.

40. *Squares,* πρασιαι. E. T. *Ranks.* The word denotes a ſmall plat, ſuch as a flower-bed in a garden. It has this meaning in Ecclus xxiv. 31. I do not find it in the Sep. or in any other part of the N. T. Theſe beds were in the form of oblong ſquares. Thus, Heſychius: Πρασιαι· αι των κηπων τετραγωνοι λοχμιαι. To the ſame purpoſe, alſo, Phavorinus. The word is, therefore, very improperly, rendered either *ranks* or *rows.* That the whole people made one compact body, an hundred men in front, and fifty deep (a conceit which has ariſen from obſerving that the product of theſe two numbers is five thouſand), appears totally inconſiſtent with the circumſtances mentioned both by Mr. who calls them, in the plural, συμποσια and πρασιαι, and by L. who calls them κλισιαι.

44 *Five thouſand,* ωσει πεντακισχιλιοι. We have the authority of all the beſt MSS. editions and verſions, Vul. Sy. &c. for rejecting ωσει, *about.*

51. *Which ſtruck them ſtill more with aſtoniſhment and admiration.* και λιαν εκ περισσου εν εαυτοις εξισαντο και εθαυμαζον. The two laſt words are wanting in three MSS. with which agree the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop. verſions.

52. *Their minds were ſtupified,* ην η καρδια αυτων πεπωρωμενη. Diſſ. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

CHAP. VII.

2. *With impure (that is, unwaſhen) hands,* κοιναις χερσι, τουτ' εστιν ανιπτοις. E. T. *With defiled (that is to ſay, with unwaſhen) hands.* The Gr. word rendered, here, *impure,* and in the E. T. *defiled,* literally ſignifies *common.* It was quite in the Jewiſh idiom, to oppoſe *common* and *holy,* the moſt uſual ſignification of the latter word, in the O. T. being, ſeparated from common, and devoted to ſacred, uſe, Diſſ. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c. Their meals were (as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, 1 Tim. iv. 5.) *ſanctified by the word of God and prayer.* They were, therefore, not to be touched with unhallowed hands. The ſuperficial Phariſee, who was uniform (wherever religion was concerned) in attending to the letter, not to the ſpirit, of the rule, underſtood this as implying ſolely that they muſt waſh their hands before they eat. As we learn, from antiquity, that this Evangeliſt wrote his Goſpel in a Pagan country, and for the uſe of Gentile converts, it was proper to add the explanation τουτ' εστιν ανιπτοις, to the epithet κοιναις, which might have otherwiſe been miſunderſtood. Pref. § 5.

3, 4. *For the Phariſees—eat not until they have waſhed their hands, by pouring a little water on them; and if they be come from the market, by dipping them*—οι γαρ Φαρισαιοι —εαν μη πυγμη νιψωνται τας χειρας, ουκ εσθιουσι,—και απο αγορας, εαν μη βαπτισωνται, ουκ εσθιουσι. E. T. *For the Phariſees—except, they waſh their hands oft, eat not; and when they come from the market, except they waſh, they eat not.* A ſmall degree of attention will ſuffice to convince a judicious reader, that there muſt be a miſtake in this verſion. For if, by what we are told, v. 3. we are to underſtand, as is allowed by every body, that they did not eat on any occaſion till they had waſhed their hands; to what purpoſe was this added, v. 4. *And when they come from the market, except they waſh, they eat not?* Could any perſon ſuppoſe that, if waſhing before meals was a duty, their having been at the market, where they were moſt expoſed to defilement, would releaſe them from the obligation? Beſides, there is, in the firſt clauſe, an indiſtinctneſs and obſcurity which leaves the reader much at a loſs for the meaning. Except they waſh oft, they eat not. Does this imply, that they muſt waſh often before every meal? or that their waſhing frequently before one meal will compenſate for their

not

not washing at all before another? It is well known, and indeed the circumstances of the story, as related here, and in Mt. may satisfy us, that neither of these was the case. For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, 1st, that the two verbs, rendered *wash* in the E. T. are different in the original. The first is νιψωνται, properly translated *wash*; the second is βαπτισωνται, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for βαπτιζω denotes *to plunge, to dip*. This naturally suggests the idea, that the word πυγμη, in the first clause, added to νιψωνται, may express the manner of washing, and so complete the contrast in the first and second clauses. Πυγμη, according to the old lexicographers, signifies the fist, or the hand contracted for grasping; but I find no authority for rendering it *oft*. In modern lexicons *crebro* is admitted as one meaning. But this, I suspect, is solely because the Vul. so translates the word in this passage. The suspicion of Er. is not implausible, that the old translator had read πυκνη. Perhaps it is still more likely, that he had supposed πυγμη to have come into the place of πυκνη, through the blunder of some early copist. The first Sy. translator has, from the same cause, the not understanding of the import of πυγμη in this place, rendered it by a word denoting *carefully*, which, though equally unwarranted, suits the sense better than *crebro*. The. who is in this followed by Euth. supposes that the word may mean *up to the elbow*. But as neither of these seems to have been versed in Jewish ceremonies, their judgment, in a point of this kind, is of little weight. Besides, it destroys the contrast clearly indicated by the Evangelist between νιπτειν and βαπτιζειν. The opinion of Wet. I think with bishop Pearce, is, on the whole, far the most probable, that the word denotes here a *handful*. This is, at least, analogical. Thus *foot*, in most languages, denotes, "the length of the foot." The like may be said of *cubit* and *span*. As the sense manifestly supplies the word *water*, the import is a handful (that is, a small quantity) of water. "Βαπτιζεσθαι," says that excellent critic, "est manus aquæ immergere, νιπτεσθαι manibus affundere." This is more especially the import, when the words are, as here, opposed to each other. Otherwise νιπτειν, like the general word *to wash* in Eng. may be used for βαπτιζειν, *to dip*, because the genus comprehends the species; but not conversely βαπτιζειν for νιπτειν, the species for the genus. By this interpretation, the words, which, as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical; and the contrast in the Gr. is preserved in the translation. The Vul. does not confound the two verbs as the E. T. does; at the same time it fails in marking the precise meaning of each. *Pharisæi enim—nisi crebro laverint manus, non manducant; et a foro nisi baptizentur, non comedunt*. Ar. whose object is to trace etymology, not to speak either intelligibly or properly, renders πυγμη *pugillatim*. Be. as unmeaningly, says *pugno*. Er. Leo, Cal. and Cas. follow the Vul. the three former saying *crebro*, the last *sæpe*. None of them sufficiently distinguishes the two verbs. They use the verb *lavare*, in the active voice, in the first clause, in the passive in the second; seeming to intimate, that in the first case the hands only were washed; in the second the whole body. The Vul. gives countenance to this interpretation. But it ought to be observed, that βαπτισωνται is not in the passive voice, but in the middle, and is contrasted to νιψωνται, also in the middle; so that by every rule the latter must be understood actively, as well as the former. All the modern versions I have seen, are, less or more, exceptionable in the same way.

4. *Baptisms of cups*, βαπτισμους ποτηριων. E. T. *The washing of cups*. I have chosen to retain the orignal word for the following reasons: First, It is not an ordinary washing, for the sake of cleanliness, which a man may perform in any way he thinks convenient, that is here meant; but it is a religious ceremony, practised in consequence of a sacred obligation, real or imagined. Secondly, The analogy that subsists in phraseology between the rites of the old dispensation and those of the new, ought, in my opinion, to be more clearly exhibited in translations of Scripture, than they generally are. It is evident, that first John's *baptism*, and afterwards the Christian, though of a more spiritual nature, and directed to a more sublime end, originated in the usages that had long obtained among the Jews. Yet, from the style of our Bible, a mere Eng. reader would not discover that affinity, which in this, and some other instances, is so manifest to the learned. The Heb. טבל perfectly corresponds to the Gr. βαπτω and βαπτιζω, which are synonymous, and is always rendered by one or other of them in the Sep. I am not for multiplying technical terms, and therefore should not blame a translation wherein the words *baptize*, *baptism*, and others of the same stamp, were not used; if in their stead we had words of our own growth, of the same import. Only let uniformity be observed, whether in admitting, or in rejecting them; for thus we shall sooner attain the scriptural use, and discover how far the latter were analogous to the former institutions. If it be asked, why I have not then rendered βαπτισωνται, in the preceding clause, *baptize?* I answer, 1st, That the appellation *baptisms*, here given to such washings, fully answers the purpose; and, 2dly, That the way I have rendered that word, shows better the import of the contrast between it and νιψωνται, so manifestly intended by the Evangelist. The Vul. in this instance, favours this manner, saying here, *baptismata calicum*, and Heb. ix. 10. *variis baptismatibus*; but has not been imitated by later translators, not even by those who translated from the Vul. and have been zealous for retaining the words which are retained in that version, as consecrated.

9. *Ye judge well, continued he, in annulling*, και ελεγεν αυτοις, Καλως αθετειτε. E. T. *And he said unto them, Full well ye reject*. Bishop Pearce justly prefers the marginal version, *frustrate*, to the textuary *reject*. But I cannot approve his other amendment of disjoining

joining the adverb καλως, from αθετειτε, with which the ſtructure of the ſentence leads us to connect it, and prefixing it to λεγων, thus making it, *he ſaid well.* It would be a ſufficient reaſon againſt this alteration, that, where there is not a good reaſon for changing, it is ſafer to follow the order of the words in the original. But were the Gr. what it is not, equally favourable to both interpretations, there is the ſtrongeſt reaſon here for preferring the common one. It is not in the manner of theſe biographers, nor does it ſuit the taſte that prevails in their writings, to introduce any thing ſaid by our Lord, accompanied with an epithet expreſſing the opinion of the writer. They tell the world what he ſaid and what he did, but invariably leave the judgement that ought to be formed about both, to the diſcernment of the readers. The declared verdicts of others, whether friends or enemies, as becomes faithful hiſtorians, they alſo relate; but, like zealous diſciples, wholly intent on exhibiting their Maſter, they care not that they themſelves paſs totally unnoticed. Their manner is exactly that of thoſe who conſidered all his words and actions as far above ſtanding in need of the feeble aid of their praiſe. The two examples produced by that author do not in the leaſt juſtify the change, nor invalidate a ſyllable of what has been now advanced. In neither are they the words of the Evangeliſt, but of the interlocutors introduced in the hiſtory. The firſt is, J. viii. 48. Οι Ιουδαιοι ειπον αυτω, Ου καλως λεγομεν, The Jews ſaid to him, *Have we not reaſon to ſay?* The other is, xiii. 13. where our Lord ſays, Υμεις φωνειτε με Ο διδασκαλος και Ο κυριος, και καλως λεγετε, *Ye call me, The teacher, and The maſter, and ye ſay right.* I am aware that the difference may be thought immaterial; but I cannot help conſidering the ſlighteſt alteration as material, which affects the taſte of theſe invaluable writings, and thereby tends to deprive us of an important criterion of their genuineneſs and divine original. Diſſ. III. § 18.—*Ye judge well.* This is ſpoken ironically. See notes on Mt. xxiii. 32. and xxvi. 45. and on J. iv. 17.

11, 12. *But ye maintain,* '*If a man ſay to father or* '*mother, Be it corban (that is, devoted) whatever of mine* '*ſhall profit thee,*' *he muſt not thenceforth do aught for his father or his mother,* υμεις δε λεγετε, Εαν ανθρωπος τω πατρι η τη μητρι, Κορβαν (ο εστι δωρον) ο εαν εξ εμου ωφεληθης· και ουκετι αφιετε αυτον ουδεν ποιησαι τω πατρι αυτου η τη μητρι αυτου. E. T. *But ye ſay,* '*If a man ſhall ſay to his* '*father or mother, It is corban (that is to ſay, a gift)* '*by whatſoever thou mighteſt be profited by me,*' *he ſhall be free; and ye ſuffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother.* For the illuſtration of this paſſage, in which it muſt be acknowledged there is ſome difficulty, let us, firſt, attend to the phraſe, *it is corban.* As *corban,* in the original, is not accompanied with the ſubſtantive verb, it ſuits better the import of the paſſage, to ſupply it in the imperative, *be it,* than in the indicative, *it is.* Whatever the man meant to do, it is evident that, by the form of words ſpecified, the thing was done, and he was bound. The expreſſion, therefore, ought not to imply that the obligation had been contracted before. Be. who has been followed by moſt modern tranſlators, erred in inſerting the verb *eſt.* He ought either, with the Vul. to have left the ellipſis unſupplied, or to have ſaid *fit,* or *eſto.* Κορβαν is a Sy. word, which this Evangeliſt, who did not write in a country where that language was ſpoken, has explained by the Gr. word δωρον, and ſignifies here *a gift* made to God, or *a thing devoted.* Our tranſlators ſay, *by whatſoever thou mighteſt be profited by me;* that is, when expreſſed more fully, '*That is corban,* whatever it be, '*by which thou mighteſt be profited by me.*' Now, as to meaning of the expreſſion, ſome explain it as importing, '*Let every donation I make to God turn out* '*to thy advantage.*' And they ſuppoſe, that when a man has once ſaid this, he is, every time he makes a preſent to the temple, or an oblation on the altar, to be conſidered as diſcharging the duty he owes to his parents. This ſeems to be the ſenſe of the Vul. *Si dixerit homo patri aut matri, Corban (quod eſt donum) quodcunque ex me tibi profuerit.* To the ſame purpoſe, though in different words, Er. Zu. Cal. and Caſ. From Be.'s verſion it would be difficult to conclude what had been his apprehenſion of the meaning. His words are, *Si quiſpiam dixerit patri vel matri, Corban, (id eſt donum) eſt, quocunque a me juvari poſſes, infons erit.* But by a marginal note on the parallel paſſage in Mt. he has ſhown that his idea was the ſame with that of the ancient interpreter, "Senſus eſt quicquid templo "donavero, cedet in rem tuam, perinde enim eſt, "ac ſi tibi dedero." There are ſeveral reaſons which lead me to think, that this cannot be the ſenſe of the words. In the firſt place, ſuch a method of transferring the benefit of oblations and gifts (if compatible with their uſages, which I very much doubt) would have deprived the giver of all the advantages reſulting from them. We may believe it would not ſuit the ſyſtem of the covetous and politic Phariſees, who were the depoſitaries of the ſacred treaſure, to propagate the opinion, that the ſame gifts and offerings could be made equally to redound to the benefit of two or three as of one. This would have been teaching the people an economy in their oblations and preſents to the temple, which but ill ſuited the ſpirit of their doctrine. 2dly, The effect of this declaration could, at the moſt, only have been to releaſe the ſon, who ſaid ſo, from the obligation of giving any ſupport to his father, or doing aught for him; but it could never be conſtrued into a poſitive obligation to do nothing. By ſaying '*I will do this for you, I will* '*transfer to you the merit of all my oblations,*' I cannot be underſtood to preclude myſelf from doing as much more as I pleaſe. Yet this was the effect of the words mentioned, as we learn from the ſacred writers. Thus Mt. ſays expreſsly, that after a man has made this declaration, ου μη τιμηση (rather τιμησει, as it is in ſome noted MSS. and early editions), *He ſhall not honour his father or his mother.* I know, that in Be.'s tranſlation, and thoſe which follow it, this argument is in a manner annihilated. By making the

words now quoted belong to the hypothetical part of the ſentence, and introducing, as the ſubſequent member, without warraat from the original, the words *he ſhall be free*, tranſlators have darkened and enervated the whole. But that the doctrine of the Phariſees extended further than to releaſe the child from the duty of ſupporting his parents; nay, that it extended ſo far as to bring him under an obligation, not to ſupport them, is ſtill more evident from what is told by Mr. ουκ ετι αφιετε, *Ye ſuffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother.* This plainly expreſſes, not that he is at liberty to do nothing for them, if he chuſe to do nothing, but that he muſt never after do aught for them, if he would. This appears, even from the common tranſlation, whoſe words I have quoted; though the paſſage is greatly marred by the ſame unwarranted ſupply as in Mt. I may juſtly ſay *marred*, ſince the words ſupplied are inconſiſtent with thoſe which follow. A man is free, who may do, or not do, as he pleaſes. This was not the caſe. The ſame act which ſuperſeded the obligation of the commandment, brought him under a counter-obligation, which, according to the Phariſaical doctrine, he was leſs at liberty to infringe than ever he had been with regard to the former. The method of getting rid of God's commandment, we ſee, was eaſy; but there was no releaſe from their tradition. 3dly, Our Lord, in both places, mentions two commandments of the law, in regard to parents, the one enjoining honour to them, the other prohibiting, under the ſevereſt ſanction, that kind of diſhonour which conſiſts in contumelious words. Both are introduced in illuſtration of the ſentiment with which he began, that they preferred their own traditions to the commandments of God. Now the mention of the divine denunciation againſt thoſe who treat their parents with reproachful language; was foreign to the purpoſe, if there was nothing in the maxims of the Phariſees here animadverted on, which tended to encourage ſuch criminal conduct. But the ſpeech of the ſon, as thoſe interpreters explain it, "May every offering I make to "God redound to your advantage," cannot be ſaid to be abuſive, or even diſreſpectful. With whatever view it may be ſpoken, it carries the appearance of reverence and regard. See Mt. xv. 4. N. The An. Eng. verſion has ſuggeſted a different meaning, to wit, that the ſon had actually given, or intended to give, to the temple, all that he could afford to beſtow on his parents. *If any one ſhall tell his father or his mother, that what he could beſtow for their relief is* corban, *that is, to be given to the temple; you diſcharge him from any obligation of doing any thing for his father or his mother.* And in the parallel paſſage in Mt. it is—*is dedicated to the temple*,—though the original does not authoriſe the change of the tenſe. This meaning Mr. Harwood alſo has introduced into his paraphraſe, which he calls a liberal tranſlation. Mt. xv. 5. *But you, in direct oppoſition to this divine command, ſay, That whoſoever dedicates his ſubſtance to pious aad religious uſes, is under no obligation to relieve an aged and neceſſitous parent.* And Mr. vii. 11, 12—*that, if any man bequeath his fortune to the ſervice of the temple, from that moment he ceaſes to be under any obligation at all, to relieve the moſt preſſing wants of his aged and neceſſitous parents.* I do not think it neceſſary to attempt a refutation of this opinion, or, rather, theſe opinions; for more ways than one are ſuggeſted here, and a ſort of caſuiſtry, which, by the way, favours more of the corruptions of the church than of thoſe of the ſynagogue. Only let it be obſerved, that the ſecond and third arguments urged againſt the former hypotheſis, ſerve equally againſt this; to which I ſhall add, that, as no Jewiſh cuſtoms have been alleged in ſupport of it, it is far from being what the words would naturally ſuggeſt. If ſuch had been our Lord's meaning, the obvious expreſſion would have been, not, If a man ſay to his father, but If a man dedicate or bequeath to the temple. Whereas the emphaſis in the text is laid entirely on what he ſays, not on what he does, or intends to do. For my part, I agree with thoſe who think that by the expreſſion which I have rendered, *be it devoted, whatever of mine ſhall profit thee*, the ſon did not directly give, or mean to give, any thing to God; he only precluded himſelf from giving any relief to his parents. For if he ſhould afterwards repent of his raſhneſs, and ſupply them with any thing, he had by (what I may call) eventually devoting it to God, given, according to the Phariſaic doctrine, the ſacred treaſury a title to reclaim it. Gro. is of opinion, that this chance of eventual profit to the treaſury, whereof the prieſts, and the leading men of the Phariſees, had the management, contributed not a little to the eſtabliſhment of ſuch impious maxims. The words, therefore, *be it corban*, or *devoted*, involve an imprecation againſt himſelf, if he ſhall ever beſtow any thing to relieve the neceſſities of his parents; as if he ſhould ſay to them, 'May I incur all the infamy of ſacri-'lege and perjury, if ever ye get a farthing from 'me;' than which we can hardly conceive any thing ſpoken by a ſon to his parents, more contemptuous, more unnatural, more barbarous, and conſequently more juſtly termed κακολογια, *opprobrious language.* Lightfoot quotes a paſſage from a Rabbinical performance, which ſets the intent of ſuch expreſſions in the cleareſt light. When a man had a mind to make a vow againſt uſing any particular thing, ſuppoſe wine, he ſaid, Let all the wine that I ſhall taſte be *conem*, a word of ſimilar import with *corban*. By ſaying ſo, it was not underſtood that he devoted any thing to God, but that he bound himſelf never to taſte wine. And if, notwithſtanding this, he was afterwards induced to drink wine, he became both ſacrilegious and perjured; ſacrilegious, becauſe the wine was no ſooner taſted by him than it was ſacred; perjured, becauſe he had broken his vow; for ſuch declarations were of the nature of vows. It appears from Maimonides, that the term came, at length, to denote any thing prohibited. To ſay, It is *corban* to me, is to ſay, I dare not uſe it; to me it is all one as though it were conſecrated to God. In the above explanation, we are ſupported by the authority of Gro. Capellus, Lightfoot, all

deeply conversant in Jewish literature; with whom also agree these latter critics, L. Cl. Beau. Wh. Wet. Pearce, and several others. Some of our late Eng. translators seem also to have adopted this interpretation. The only difficulty that remains in the sentence arises from the conjunction και, which, in sentences conditional or comparative, where the concluding member has an immediate dependence on the preceding, appears to break the natural connection, by forming one of a different kind. To this I answer, with Gro. that the και in the N. T. like the Heb. ו, is sometimes a mere expletive, and sometimes has the power of other conjunctions. I shall mention some of the examples in the Gospels, referred to by that author. The learned reader may compare the original with the common translation, Mt. xxviii. 9. L. ii. 15. 21. v. 35. ix. 51. In all these, the translators have dropped the copulative entirely. In L. ii. 27, 28. they have rendered it *then*, and in L. xiv. 1. *that*. Every impartial person will judge whether it be a greater latitude in translating to omit a conjunction, which, in certain cases not dissimilar, is allowed to be an expletive, or to insert, rather interpolate, a whole clause, which is not only not necessary, but not altogether consistent with the rest of the passage. The last clause, v. 12. is here rendered more according to the sense, than according to the letter. 'Ye maintain—he must not do,' is entirely equivalent to, 'Ye do not permit him to do:' for it was only what they permitted or prohibited by their doctrine, of which he was speaking. But the former is the only way here of preserving the tenor of the discourse. In the latter, the first member of the sentence is in the words of the Pharisees, the second in the words of our Lord.

19. *It entereth not into his heart, but into his belly, whence all impurities in the victuals pass into the sink,* ουκ εισπορευεται αυτου εις την καρδιαν, αλλ' εις την κοιλιαν, και εις τον αφεδρωνα εκπορευεται, καθαριζον παντα τα βρωματα. E. T. *It entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats.* A late learned prelate, whom I have had occasion often to quote, proposes a different version of the above passage. The way in which he would render it, as may be collected from his commentary and notes, is this; *It entereth not into his heart, but into his stomach, and goeth out in the lower part of the belly which purgeth all meats.* Κοιλια, he says, commonly rendered *belly*, is often used for στομαχος, *stomach*. Thus, Mt. xii. 40. Jonah is said to have been, εν τη κοιλια, in the belly [that is, *stomach*] of the great fish. But let it be observed, that the Gr. word κοιλια, in no other way imports στομαχος, than as the Eng. word *belly* imports *stomach*. With us it is equally proper to say, that Jonah was in *the belly*, as that he was in *the stomach*, of the fish. Thus we say of gluttons, that all their care is to fill their bellies. Yet in such cases we could not say that either the Gr. word, or the Eng. is used in an acceptation different from the common. Whatever goes into the stomach, goes into the belly, of which the stomach is a part. Whosoever goes to Rome goes to Italy. It is common to every language often to express the part by the whole, and the species by the genus. This kind of synecdoché is so familiar, and even so strictly proper, as hardly to deserve a place among the tropes. Let it be observed farther, that when a more extensive or general term is used, every thing advanced must be suited to the common acceptation of the term. Thus I may say indifferently, that our food goes into the stomach, or into the belly; but if I use the latter term, I cannot add, it passes thence into the intestines (these being also in the belly), which I might have added, if in the first clause I had used the word stomach. The same holds also of the corresponding expressions in Gr. and for the same reason. Yet, in this glaringly improper manner, does the Evangelist express himself, if αφεδρων, as the Bishop explains it, mean a part of the belly. If it were necessary to go farther into this examination, it might be observed, that αφεδρων, by the explanation produced from Suidas and Pasor, which makes it, at the most, answer only to the *intestinum rectum*, will not suit his purpose, the secretion of the chyle being more the work of the other intestines. Let it, at the same time, be remembered, that the version *latrina, secessus*, is admitted, on all sides, to be according to the common meaning of the word. Add to this, that καθαριζον is susceptible of an easy explanation on this hypothesis. It agrees with παν; but παν does not relate to βρωματα. It must be explained from the subject treated, παν κοινον, παν ακαθαρτον. Nor can any thing be clearer than the meaning and construction, when the words are thus explained: 'Any impurity 'that should enter from without, with the food, into 'the body, can never contaminate the man, because it 'nowise affects his mind, but passeth into his belly, 'whence it is thrown out into the sink, leaving what is 'fit for nourishment, clear of all dregs and defilement.' Gro. has well expressed the last clause, *Si quid est in cibo naturalis immunditiæ, id alvo ejectum purgat reliquum in corporæ cibum.* No interpretation more effectually exposes the cavil reported by Jerom. Our Lord's words, so far from implying that all that is swallowed is thrown out of the body, imply the contrary. The other interpretation requires also, that we do violence to the words in reading καθαριζοντα for καθαριζον, without the sanction of a single MS. edition, ancient version, or early writer.

22. *Insatiable desires,* πλεονεξιαι. E. T. *Covetousness.* The use of the word πλεονεξια in the Sep. warrants interpreters to render it *covetousness*, in the N. T. But in every place where the word occurs, it does not seem to be properly limited to that meaning. Phav. and Suid. both define it η υπερ της επιθυμιας του πλειονος βλαξη, they add, παρα τω αποστολω, because it is not the common classical use. Now as this definition is applicable to more vices than *avarice*, there are some passages in Scripture where the sense requires it should be rendered by a more comprehensive term. This is particularly the case when the plural number is employed, as here, and 2 Pet. ii. 14.

24. *Having*

24. *Having entered a houſe,* εισελθων εις την οικιαν. But a great number of MSS. many of them of the firſt note, have no article. Some of the earlieſt and beſt editions have none. The Sy. and the Go. interpreters have not read the article. It is rejected by Wet. and moſt critics.

26. *A Greek,* Ἑλληνις. This woman is called, Mt. xv. 21. *Canaanitiſh;* here *a Syrophenician,* and *a Greek.* There is in theſe denominations no inconſiſtency. By birth, ſhe was of *Syrophenicia;* ſo the country about Tyre and Sidon was denominated; by deſcent, of *Canaan,* as moſt of the Tyrians and Sidonians originally were; and by religion, *a Greek,* according to the Jewiſh manner of diſtinguiſhing between themſelves and idolaters. Ever ſince the Macedonian conqueſts, Greek became a common name for idolater, or at leaſt one uncircumciſed, and was held equivalent to Gentile. Of this we have many examples in Paul's Epiſtles, and in the Acts. *Jews and Greeks,* Ἑλληνις, are the ſame with *Jews and Gentiles.*

31. *Leaving the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he returned,* παλιν εξελθων εκ των ὁριων Τυρου και Σιδωνος, ηλθε. Vul. *Iterum exiens de finibus Tyri, venit per Sidonem.* Agreeable to which are the Cop. and the Sax. verſions, as well as the Cam. and two other MSS. which, inſtead of the three laſt words in Gr. read ηλθε δια Σιδωνος. Whatever may have recommended this reading to Dr. Mill, it has no external evidence worth mentioning, and is, beſides, in itſelf, exceedingly improbable. Our Lord's miniſtry was to the Jews: and to their country he appears to have confined his journies. Even Si. and Maldonat, though both, eſpecially the laſt, not a little partial to the Vul. give the preference here to the common Gr. Maldonat ſays, "Credendum non eſt, Chriſtum in urbes in Gentilium ingreſſum fuiſſe, "qui non niſi ad oves quæ perierant domûs Iſrael, ſe miſſum dixerat."

CHAP. VIII.

12. *No ſign ſhall be given to this generation,* ει δοθησεται τη γενεα ταυτη σημειον. As the negative in the original is expreſſed by the conditional particle ει *if,* Simon, in his note on the place, mentions this as an argument, that the words are of the nature of the oath. "Cette "particule *ſi* ſemble indiquer le ſerment." It is true that, among the Hebrews, the form of an oath by imprecation was very common. *God do ſo to me, and more alſo,* ſaid Ruth to her mother-in-law, *if aught but death part thee and me.* This was an oath that ſhe would not leave her. Sometimes there was an ellipſis of the curſe, and no more than the hypothetical clauſe was expreſſed. In this caſe, the conditional conjunction had the force of negation, if there was no negative in the ſentence, and the contrary effect, if there was. But as uſe in every tongue gradually varies, it is manifeſt, and might be proved by examples, that the conditional particle came, at length, in many caſes, to be underſtood merely as a negative. That it is ſo here, we need no better evidence, than that, in all the other places of the Goſpels, where we have the ſame declaration, what is here expreſſed by ει δοθησεται σημειον, is expreſſed in them by σημειον ου δοθησεται. Mt. xii. 39. xvi. 4. and L. xi. 29. notes.

24. *Having looked up,* και αναβλεψας. E. T. *And he looked up.* Αναβλεπω ſometimes ſignifies *to recover ſight,* ſometimes *to look upwards* to an object ſituated above us, ſometimes to *raiſe our eyes* from looking downwards, or even from a ſtate of paſſiveneſs to exertion. In this ſenſe, *to look up* is often uſed in Eng. As the ſubject, here, is the cure of a blind man, many are led to prefer the firſt of theſe ſenſes. My reaſons, for thinking differently, are as follows: 1ſt, When αναβλεπω, in the Goſpel, ſignifies *to recover ſight,* it indicates a complete recovery, which was not the caſe here. 2dly, If it denote, here, *he recovered his ſight,* there is a contradiction in the paſſage, as the ſame reaſon would lead us to infer, from the very next verſe, that he had not recovered it; for Jeſus, after doing ſomething further, εποιησεν αυτον αναβλεψαι, made him again look up. 3dly, Becauſe the man's recovering his ſight is expreſſed by a diſtinct clauſe, αποκατεσταθη και ενεβλεψε τηλαυγως. There is no reaſon to adopt the ſecond meaning mentioned, as the objects he had to look at appear to have been on a level with himſelf. The third ſenſe, therefore, which is that of the E. T. ſeems entitled to the preference. The application is ſimilar to that in the Sep. Iſ. xlii. 18. Οι τυφλοι αναβλεψατε ιδειν. E. T. *Look, ye blind, that ye may ſee.* That the word is ſometimes uſed for looking at things not placed above us, is alſo evident from L. xxi. 1.

24. *I ſee men, whom I diſtinguiſh from trees only by their walking,* βλεπω τους ανθρωπους ὡς δενδρα περιπατουντας. E. T. *I ſee men as trees walking.* But in many MSS. ſome of them of principal note, in ſeveral old editions, and in the commentaries of The. and Euth. the words are, Βλεπω τους ανθρωπους, ὁτι ὡς δενδρα ὁρω περιπατουντας. This reading is preferred by both Mill and Wet. and is followed by Caſ. and ſome modern interpreters. Thus, the ſentence is made to conſiſt of two members, whereof the ſecond is introduced as the reaſon for ſaying, in the firſt, that he ſaw men. I have endeavoured to give a juſt expreſſion of the ſenſe in the verſion.

26. *Neither go into the village, nor tell aught to any of the villagers,* μηδε εις την κωμην εισελθης, μηδε ειπης τινι εν τη κωμη. Vul. *Vade in domum tuam; et ſi in vicum introieris, nemini dixeris.* This verſion has evidently ſprung from a different reading; as there has been, in fact, a good deal of variety, here, both in MSS. and in verſions. The Sy. and a great majority of MSS. favour the common reading. Some have thought that there is an impropriety in that reading, as it ſeems to ſuppoſe they could relate the miracle to people in the village, though they did not enter it. But the words, οι εν τη κωμη, are no more than a periphraſis for the villagers.

28. *And others, one of the Prophets,* αλλοι δε ὡς των προφητων. Vul. *Alii vero quaſi unum de Prophetis.* In conformity to which, the Cam. alone reads ὡς before ὡς.

31. *Be rejected,* αποδοκιμασθηναι. This word is, probably, uſed in reference to the expreſſion in the Pſalms, *The ſtone which the builders rejected,* ὁν απεδοκιμασαν, as it is rendered by the Seventy.

37. *What will a man not give? τι δωσει ανθρωπος;* E. T. *What ſhall a man give?* Gro. juſtly obſerves, that τι, here, is equivelent to ποσα; *How much! What great things!* The emphaſis is better expreſſed, in our language, by the negative, which, however ſtrange it may appear, more exactly hits the ſenſe than a literal verſion.

2. *Ranſom,* ανταλλαγμα. E. T. *Exchange.* The Gr. word means both; but the firſt is, in the preſent caſe, the only proper term in Eng. We ranſom what by law, war, or accident, is forfeited, and in the power of another, though we may ſtill be in poſſeſſion: but we always exchange what we have for what we have not. If a man's life be actually taken, it is too late for bartering.

CHAP. IX.

12, 13. *And (as it is written of the Son of Man),* και πως γεγραπται επι τον υιον του ανθρωπου. E. T. *And how it is written of the Son of Man?* Twelve MSS. amongſt which are the Al. and two others of note, read καθως for και πως. I cannot help thinking this a ſufficient warrant for receiving it, when, by the rules of conſtruction, no proper meaning can be drawn from the words as they lie. The Vul. and Zu. follow the common reading, and render πως *quomodo.* Er. Caſ. Cal. ſay *quemadmodum;* which may be interpreted either way. Be. whether it was that he judged καθως the true reading, or that he thought πως, here, of the ſame import, renders it *ut.* In this he has been followed by the G. F. which ſays *comme,* and Dio. who ſays *ſicome.* It gives an additional probability, that a ſimilar clauſe, v. 13. relating to John, as this does to Jeſus, and which ſeems, in ſome reſpect, contraſted with it, is uſhered in with the conjunction καθως, καθως γεγραπται επ' αυτον. This clauſe is very generally underſtood, by interpreters, as relating to the coming, not to the ſufferings, of the Baptiſt. I have, therefore, for the ſake of perſpecuity, tranſpoſed it.

24. *Supply thou the defects of my faith,* βοηθει μου τη απιστια. E. T. *Help thou mine unbelief.* It is evident, from the preceding clauſe, πιστευω, that απιστια denotes, here, a *deficient faith,* not a total *want of faith.* I have uſed the word *ſupply,* as hitting more exactly what I take to be the ſenſe of the paſſage. Gro. juſtly expreſſes it, *Quod fiduciæ meæ deeſt, bonitate tua ſupple.* His reaſon for not thinking that the man aſked an immediate and miraculous increaſe of faith, appears well founded: "Nam ut augmentum fiduciæ ab Jeſu ſperaverit, et "quidem ſubito, vix credible eſt." The words, however, in the way I have rendered them, are ſuſceptible of either meaning, and ſo have all the latitude of the original.

25. *He rebuked,* επετιμησε. Vul. *Comminatus eſt;* that is, *he ſeverely threatened.* In this manner the Gr. word is rendered in the Vul. no fewer than eight times in this Goſpel, where it occurs only nine times. This is the more remarkable, as in the Goſpels of Mr. and L. where we often meet with it, it is not once ſo rendered, not even in the parallel paſſages to thoſe in Mr. No La. tranſlator, that I know, has in this imitated the Vul. Some ſay, *objurgavit;* ſome *increpavit,* or *increpuit.* Beau. who ſays *menaça,* and Lu. who ſays **bedrauete,** are the only perſons I know, who, in tranſlating from the Gr. into modern languages, have employed a word denoting *threatened.* If there were more evidence than there is, that this is one uſual acceptation of the term, there would ſtill be ſufficient ground for rejecting it as not the meaning of the Evangeliſts. For, 1ſt, the verb επιτιμαω is uſed when the object addreſſed is inanimate, as *the wind, the ſea, a natural diſeaſe;* for though, in ſuch caſes, even when rendered *rebuke* or *command,* there is a proſopopeia; yet, as we immediately perceive the ſenſe, the expreſſion derives both luſtre and energy from the trope; whereas the mention of threats, which always introduces the idea of puniſhment to be inflicted on diſobedience, being nowiſe appoſite to the ſubject, could ſerve only to render the expreſſion ridiculous. 2dly, The evangeliſts have often given us the very words of the επιτιμησεις uſed by Jeſus, but in no inſtance do we diſcover in them any thing of the nature of menace. We have one example in this very verſe, for it is επετιμησε λεγων. 3dly, The ſame word is adopted, Mt. xvi. 22. to expreſs the rebuke given by Peter to his Maſter, in which it would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that he employed threats. 4thly, The Gr. commentator Euth. has given, on Mt. xii. 16. the word παρηγγειλε as ſynonymous to επετιμησε. 5thly, Recourſe to threats, in the orders given to individuals, would ill ſuit either the meekneſs or the dignity of character uniformly ſupported by our Lord. Even the verb εμβριμαομαι, though nearer in its ordinary ſignification to that of the La. *comminor,* yet in no place of the Goſpels, can properly be rendered *to threaten.* It is twice uſed by J. for *to groan,* or *to ſigh deeply.* There are only two other paſſages in which it is applied to our Lord, once by Mt. and once by Mr. In both places the words he uſed are recorded, and they contain no *threatening* of any kind. The only term for *threat,* in theſe writers, is απειλη, for *to threaten* απειλειν and προσαπειλειν.

29. *This kind cannot be diſlodged, unleſs by prayer and faſting.* Τουτο το γενος εν ουδενι δυναται εξελθειν, ει μη εν προσευχη και νηστια. E. T. *This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and faſting.* Some doubts have been raiſed in

in regard to the meaning of the words *this kind*. The moſt obvious interpretation is, doubtleſs, that which refers them to the word *demon* immediately preceding. But as, in the parallel paſſage in Mt. xvii. 19. mention is made of *faith*, as the neceſſary qualification for diſpoſſeſſing demons; Knatchbul, and others, have thought that *this kind* refers to the *faith* that is requiſite. But to me it appears an inſurmountable objection to this hypotheſis, that we have here the ſame ſentiment, almoſt the ſame expreſſion, and uſhered in with the ſame words, *this kind*, though, in what goes before, there is no mention of faith, or of any thing but demon, to which it can refer. It would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that the pronouns and relatives in one Goſpel refer to antecedents in another. Every one of the Goſpels does, indeed, give additional information; and, in various ways, ſerves to throw light upon the reſt. But every Goſpel muſt be a conſiſtent hiſtory by itſelf; otherwiſe, to attempt an explanation would be in vain. Now, my argument ſtands thus: The ſtory, related in both Goſpels, is manifeſtly the ſame; that the words in queſtion may refer to *demon* in Mt. no perſon who attentively reads the paſſage, can deny; that they cannot refer to *faith*, but muſt refer to *demon* in Mr. is equally evident. Either, then, they refer to *demon* in both, or the Evangeliſts contradict one another. Other arguments might be mentioned: one is, that the application of γενος, to an abſtract quality, ſuch as *faith*, is I ſuſpect, unexampled in the language of Scripture; whereas, its application to different orders of beings, or real exiſtences, is perfectly common. Some have conſidered it as an objection to the above explanation, that it ſuppoſes different kinds of *demons*; and that the expulſion of ſome kinds is more difficult than that of others. I anſwer, 1ſt, The objection is founded entirely in our ignorance. Who can ſay that there are not different kinds of demons? or, that there may not be degrees in the power of expelling? Revelation has not ſaid that they are all of one kind, and may be expelled with equal eaſe. I anſwer, 2dly, By *this kind*, is not meant this kind of demons, but this kind or order of beings called demons. And if there be any implicit compariſon in the words, it is with other cures. Another objection is, that in Mt. xvii. 20. the power of expulſion is aſcribed ſolely to faith; whereas here, it is aſcribed to prayer and faſting. The anſwer to this objection will, perhaps, ſhow, that the queſtion does not ſo much affect the import of the paſſage, as it affects the grammatical conſtruction and literal interpretation of the words. By the declaration, *This kind cannot be diſlodged, unleſs by prayer and faſting*, we are not (as I apprehend) to underſtand, that a certain time was to be ſpent in prayer and faſting, before the expulſion of every demon; but that the power of expelling was not otherwiſe to be attained. *Quod eſt cauſa cauſæ*, ſay dialecticians, *eſt etiam cauſa cauſati*. This is conformable to the idioms which obtain in every tongue. It was evidently concerning the power of expelling that the diſciples put the queſtion, *Why could not we——?* Now, to the attainment of that power, faſting and prayer were neceſſary, becauſe they were neceſſary for the attainment of that faith, with which it was invariably accompanied. That εξελειν ſhould be uſed according to the import of the Heb. conjugation *hophal*, may be ſupported by many ſimilar examples in the N. T.

37. *Not me, but him who ſent me*, that is, 'not ſo much me as him who ſent me.' Mt. ix. 13. 3. N.

40. *Whoever is not againſt you is for you*, Ος ουκ εστι καθ' ὑμων, ὑπερ ὑμων εστιν. But in a great number of MSS. ſome of them of note, in ſeveral editions, in the Vul. both the Sy. verſions, the Sax. and the Go. the reading is ὑμων in both places, which is alſo preferred by Gro. Mill, and Wet.

CHAP. X.

1. *Came into the confines of Judea through the country upon the Jordan*, ερχεται εις τα ὁρια της Ιουδαιας δια του περαν του Ιορδανου. Vul. *Venit in fines Judææ ultra Jordanem.* The Sy. and the Go. appear to have read in the ſame manner as the Vul. agreeably to which δια του is omitted in ſome MSS.

12. *If a woman divorce her huſband.* This practice of divorcing the huſband, unwarranted by the law, had been (as Joſephus informs us) introduced by Salome, ſiſter of Herod the Great, who ſent a bill of divorce to her huſband Coſtobarus; which bad example was afterwards followed by Herodias and others. By law, it was the huſband's prerogative to diſſolve the marriage. The wife could do nothing by herſelf. When he thought fit to diſſolve it, her conſent was not neceſſary. The bill of divorce, which ſhe received, was to ſerve as evidence for her, that ſhe had not deſerted her huſband, but was diſmiſſed by him, and conſequently free.

19. *Do no injury*, μη αποστερησης. E. T. *Defraud not.* This does not reach the full import of the Gr. verb, which comprehends alike all injuries, whether proceeding from force or from fraud, and is therefore better rendered by P. R. *Vous ne ferez tort à perſonne.* This is followed by Sa. Beau. and even by Si. himſelf, who, changing only the mood, ſays, *Ne faites tort à perſonne.* In the ſame way, Dio. has alſo rendered it, *Non far danno a niuno*; here rightly following Be. who ſays, *Ne damno quemquam afficito.* To the ſame purpoſe, the Vul. *Ne fraudem feceris*; by the ſound of which, I ſuſpect, our tranſlators have been led into the verſion, *Defraud not*, which does not hit the meaning of the La.

21. *Carrying the croſs*, αρας τον σταυρον. Theſe words are not in the Ephrem and Cam. MSS. There is nothing correſponding to them in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. verſions.

25. *Paſs through*, διελθειν. There is the ſame diverſity of reading here, which was obſerved in the parallel

place in Mt. xix. 24. But the other reading, ευκοπωτερον, is not here ſo well ſupported by either MSS. or verſions.

30. *Who ſhall not receive now, in this world, a hundred-fold, houſes, and brothers, and ſiſters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with perſecutions.* There are two difficulties in theſe words, of which I have not ſeen a ſatisfactory ſolution. The firſt is, in the promiſe, that a man ſhall receive, in this world, *a hundred-fold, houſes, and brothers*—— The ſecond is in the limitation, *with perſecutions.* As to the firſt, there is no difficulty in the promiſe, as expreſſed by the Evangeliſts Mt. and L. To ſay, barely, that men ſhall receive a hundred-fold, for all their loſſes, does not imply that the compenſation ſhall be in kind. Nor do I find any difficulty in the declaration, that thus far their recompenſe ſhall be in this world. James, i. 2. adviſes his Chriſtian brethern to *count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations.* Paul, 2. Cor. vii. 4. ſays, concerning himſelf, that he was *exceeding joyful in all his tribulation.* The ſame principle which ſerves to explain theſe paſſages, ſerves to explain the promiſe of a preſent recompenſe, as expreſſed by Mt. and L. The Chriſtian's faith, hope, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghoſt, were more than ſufficient to counterbalance all his loſſes. But if the mention of *houſes and brothers*——, add nothing to the meaning of thoſe Evangeliſts, to what purpoſe was it made by Mr.? Inſtead of enlightening, it could only miſlead, and make a retribution in kind be expected in the preſent life. Some things are mentioned, v. 29. of which a man can have only one: theſe are *father* and *mother.* In v. 30. we have *mothers*, but not *fathers.* *Wife* is mentioned, v. 29. but not *wives*, v. 30. Hence that profane ſneer of Julian, who aſked whether the Chriſtian was to get a hundred wives. As to theſe omiſſions, however, there are ſome varieties in MSS. and verſions. In v. 29. the word γυναικα is wanting in two MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. verſions. None, indeed, in v. 30. have either γυναικα or γυναικας, but many MSS. and ſome of note, read μητερα; many alſo add και πατερα; though theſe words, in the ſingular, ill ſuit the εκατονταπλασιονα, which precedes them. Theſe differences and omiſſions alſo contribute to render the paſſage ſuſpected. According to rule, if one was repeated, all ſhould have been repeated; and the conſtruction required the plural number in them all. Biſhop Pearce ſuſpects an interpolation, occaſioned by ſome marginal correction, or gloſs, which muſt have been afterwards taken into the next. If the text has been in this way corrupted, the corruption muſt have been very early, ſince the repetition, in v. 30. though with ſome variety, is found in all the ancient MSS. verſions, and commentaries extant. In a caſe of this kind, I do not think a tranſlator authoriſed to expunge a paſſage, though he may fairly mention the doubts entertained concerning it.

* As to the other queſtion about the qualifying words, μετα διωγμων, I obſerve that the Cam. and one other MS. read διωγμοις, agreeable to which is the Syriac verſion: but this makes no alteration in the ſenſe. I obſerve alſo, that there are three MSS. none of them of any name, which read μετα διωγμον, *after perſecution*, Wet. who commonly pays no regard to conjectural emendations, has, nevertheleſs, adopted this. A promiſe, according to the letter, regarding things merely temporal, to be accompanied *with perſecutions*, that learned and ingenious critic conſidered as illuſory. The more a man has, in that ſituation, his diſtreſs is the greater. He ſubjoins: "Omnia vero "plana erunt, ſi, quæ etiam ingenioſa D. Heinſii con- "jectura fuit, ſequamur codices qui habent μετα "διωγμον. Atque ita promittuntur halcyonia et "pacata tempora duris ſucceſſura." Thus, Druthmar, a Benedictine monk of the ninth century, who wrote a commentary on Mt. conſiders the riches and power of the pope, as a clear fulfilment of the promiſe with regard to Peter, who put the queſtion, and the large endowments of the monaſteries as a fulfilment to the reſt. "Nunc quoque magnum regnum habet "Petrus de villis et ſervis per omnem mundum, et ipſe "et omnes ſancti, propter amorem Dei." I own that, to me all things do not appear ſo plain, even after the alteration propoſed by Wet. If this promiſe, of temporal proſperity, be underſtood as made to individuals, how is it fulfilled to the martyrs, and to all thoſe who continue to be perſecuted to the end of their lives? But if it be underſtood, as thoſe interpreters ſeem to fancy, of the church in general, which, after a ſtate of perſecution, for near three centuries, was put by Conſtantine in a ſtate of ſecurity and proſperity; the following queſtions will naturally occur: Do not the words, here uſed, manifeſtly imply that the promiſe was intended for every diſciple who ſhould come within the deſcription? Thus, v. 29. Ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν— 30. εαν μη λαβη— The Evangeliſts, Mt. and L. are equally explicit on this head. Πας ος αφηκεν—λαμβανει—are the words of Mt. And in L. it is, Ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν— ος ου μη απολαβη. It is impoſſible for words to make it clearer. Now, could the promiſe be ſaid to affect the actual ſufferers, as the words certainly imply, if all that it meant was, 'If ye my hearers, have given up, or 'ſhall give up, every thing for my ſake, houſes, lands, 'friends—— thoſe who ſhall be in your places, three 'hundred years hence, who have ſuffered nothing, 'being themſelves perhaps good for nothing, and loſt 'nothing, ſhall be richly rewarded for what ye have 'done, and ſhall live in great opulence and ſplendour.' If underſtood, therefore, of an enjoyment which every perſecuted individual would obtain here, after all his ſufferings were over, it is not true; for many died in the cauſe: and, if underſtood of the church in general, it is not to the purpoſe; nor can it, by any interpretation, be made to ſuit the terms employed. For my part, if I were, with Heinſius and Wet. to account μετα διωγμον, *after perſecution*, the true reading, I ſhould heartily agree with thoſe who conſider this as a ſtrong evidence of the millenium; for in no other way that I know, can it be conſiſtently interpreted. I

have

have other objections againſt that interpretation which makes it relate to the change the church was to undergo, after being eſtabliſhed by the imperial laws. If our Lord's kingdom had been, what it was not, a worldly kingdom; if greatneſs in it, had reſulted, as in ſuch kingdoms, from wealth and dominion, there would have been reaſon to conſider the reign of Conſtantine as the halcyon days of the church, and a bleſſed time to all its members. But if the reverſe was the fact; if our Lord's kingdom was purely ſpiritual; if the greatneſs of any member reſulted from his humility and uſefulneſs; and if ſuperior authority aroſe purely from ſuperior knowledge and charity; if the riches of the Chriſtian conſiſted in faith and good works, I am afraid the changes, introduced by the emperor, were more the corrupters, than the eſtabliſhers, of the kingdom of Chriſt. The name, indeed, was extended, the profeſſion ſupported, and thoſe who aſſumed the name, when it became faſhionable, and a means of preferment, multiplied; but the ſpirit, the life, and the power, of religion viſibly declined every day. Let us not, then, ſhamefully confound the unrighteous Mammon with the hidden treaſures of Chriſt. Thoſe divine aphoriſms, called the beatitudes, which aſcribe happineſs to the poor, the meek, the mournful, the hungry, the perſecuted, were not calculated for a particular ſeaſon, but are evidently intended to ſerve as fundamental maxims of the Chriſtian commonwealth to the end of the world. Though there be, therefore, ſome difficulty in reconciling the words, *with perſecutions*, with what is apparently a promiſe of ſecular enjoyments, it is ſtill preferable to the other reading; both becauſe the correction is a mere gueſs, and becauſe it is leſs reconcilable than this, to the ſtate of the church militant, in any period we are yet acquainted with. For it will ever hold, that all that will live godly in Chriſt Jeſus ſhall, in ſome ſhape or other, ſuffer perſecution. And to reject, on mere conjecture, becauſe of a difficulty, real or apparent, all that Mr. has additional to what is recorded by Mt. and L. would be contrary to all the rules of ſound criticiſm; and might give riſe to a freedom which would be ſubverſive of the authority of Scripture altogether.

40. *I cannot give*, ουκ εστιν εμον δουναι. Vul. *Non eſt meum dare vobis*. In the addition of *vobis*, this interpreter is almoſt ſingular, having no warrant from MSS. and being followed only by the Sax. verſion. It is, beſides, but ill adapted to the words in connection. The ſame peculiarity in the two verſions occurs alſo in Mt. xx. 23.

42. *Thoſe who are accounted the princes*, οι δοκουντες αρχειν. E. T. *They which are accounted to rule*. The Gr. expreſſion, ſuitably to a common idiom both in ſacred and in claſſical authors, may be rendered ſimply, as though it were οι αρχοντες, *the princes*; but I think there is, here, an energy in the word δοκουντες, as denoting thoſe whom the people acknowledge and reſpect as princes. It alſo ſuits the ſenſe better to uſe the name *princes* here, than the verb *to rule*, which is not ſo well adapted to the preceding participle, *accounted*. The word *princes*, denoting ſtrictly and originally no more than *chief men*, it may, not improperly, be regarded as merely a matter of public opinion, who they are that come under this denomination. But we cannot, with propriety, expreſs ourſelves in the ſame doubtful way of thoſe who actually govern, eſpecially when they govern, as repreſented here, in a ſevere and arbitrary manner.

48. *Charged him to be ſilent*, επετιμων αυτω ινα σιωπηση. See notes on Mt. xx. 31. and ch. ix. 25.

CHAP. XI.

1. *As far as Bethpage and Bethany*, εις Βηθφαγη και Βηθανιαν. Βηθφαγη και are not in the Cam.; nor are there any words correſponding to them in the Vul. and the Sax. verſions.

10. Immediately after βασιλεια, in the common Gr. copies, we read the words, εν ονοματι Κυριε, *in the name of the Lord*; but they are wanting in ſeveral MSS. ſome of them of principal note, and in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Arm. Ara. and Sax. verſions. Origen did not read them. And they are rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. Their ſituation between βασιλεια and its regimen, του πατρος ημων, gives them much the appearance of an interpolation. Beſides, the phraſe, ερχομενος εν ονοματι Κυριε, in the preceding verſe, accounts very naturally for the inadvertency of giving ερχομενη here the ſame following.

13. *For the fig-harveſt was not yet*, η γαρ ουκ καιρος συκων. E. T. *For the time of figs was not yet*. Waving the different hypotheſes that have been adopted for explaining this expreſſion, Dr. Pearce has, from ſeveral paſſages in ſacred writ, particularly Mt. xxi. 34. juſtly obſerved, that by the time of any kind of fruit or grain, is meant the time of reaping it. This, indeed, coincides with the interpretation which a reader would naturally give it. What can the time of any fruit be, but the time of its full maturity? And what is the ſeaſon of gathering but the time of maturity? But figs may be eaten for allaying hunger, before they be fully ripe; and the declaration, that the ſeaſon of figs was not yet come, cannot be (as the order of the words, in the original, would lead one at firſt to imagine) the reaſon why there was nothing but leaves on the tree: for the fig is of that tribe of vegetables, wherein the fruit appears before the leaf. But if the words, και ελθων επ' αυτην, ουδεν ευρεν ει μη φυλλα, be read as a parentheſis, the aforeſaid declaration will be the reaſon of what immediately preceded, namely, our Lord's looking for fruit on the tree. The leaves ſhowed that the figs ſhould not only be formed, but well advanced; and the ſeaſon of reaping being not yet come, removed all

all ſuſpicion that they had been gathered. When both circumſtances are conſidered, nothing can account for its want of fruit, but the barrenneſs of the tree. If the words had been, ουδεν ευρεν ει μη ολυνθους, ου γαρ ην καιρος συκων, *he found nothing but green figs, for it was not the time of ripe fruit*; we ſhould have juſtly concluded that the latter clauſe was meant, as the reaſon of what is affirmed in the former; but, as they ſtand, they do not admit this interpretation. A tranſpoſition, entirely ſimilar, we have in ch. xvi. 34. The idiom of modern tongues, requiring a more rigid adherence to the cuſtomary arrangement, I have thought it reaſonable to tranſpoſe the clauſes.

17. *My houſe ſhall be called a houſe of prayer for all nations* οτι ὁ οικος μου οικος προσευχης κληθησεται πασι τοις εθνεσιν., E. T. *My houſe ſhall be called, of all nations, the houſe of prayer.* Our tranſlators have followed Be. who renders the paſſage, as if the laſt words had been υπο παντων των εθνων. *Domum meam domum precationis vocatum iri ab omnibus gentibus*; and is, I think, the only La. tranſlator, who, by inſerting the prepoſition *ab*, has perverted the ſenſe. He has been copied, as uſual, by the G. F. *Ma maiſon ſera appellée maiſon d'oraiſon par toutes nations.* This is an error of the ſame ſort with that which was obſerved on Mt. v. 21. See the note on that verſe. The court of the Gentiles, a part of το ιερον, *the temple*, as it is expreſſed in this paſſage, was particularly deſtined for the devout of all nations, who acknowledged the true God, though they had not ſubjected themſelves to the Moſaic law, and were accounted aliens. The proſelytes who had received circumciſion, and were by conſequence ſubject to the law, were on the ſame footing with native Jews, and had acceſs to the court of the people. Juſtly, therefore, was the temple ſtyled *a houſe of prayer for all nations.* The error in the common verſion is here the more extraordinary, as, in their tranſlation of Iſaiah, they render the paſſage quoted *for all people.*

2. There is another error, in the common verſion, in this paſſage, which, for aught I know, is peculiar to it. Οικος is rendered *the houſe*, not *a houſe*, as it ought to be. This difference, though on a ſuperficial view it may appear inconſiderable, is, in truth, of the greateſt moment. *The houſe of prayer* was the utmoſt that a Jew could have ſaid of the temple of Jeruſalem. To repreſent all the Gentiles, moſt of whom knew nothing about it, and the reſt, at the furtheſt, put it on no better footing than the idol-temples of the ſurrounding nations, as uſing a ſtyle which implied that it was, by way of eminence, the place of all the earth appropriated to divine worſhip, is both miſrepreſenting the fact, and miſrepreſenting the ſacred writers, who are far from advancing any thing that can be juſtly ſo interpreted.

18. *For they dreaded him*, εφοβουντο γαρ αυτον. I ſee no reaſon for rejecting the αυτον on ſo ſlight authority as ſix or ſeven MSS. Their fear of the people, mentioned in other paſſages, ſo far from being inconſiſtent, naturally led them to dread one who had ſo great an aſcendancy over the minds of the people, who expoſed the hypocriſy of the ſpiritual guides of the age, and was ſo much an enemy to their traditions and ſophiſtry.

21. *Which thou haſt devoted*, ην κατηρασω. E. T. *Which thou curſedſt.* In Eng. the word *curſed* is not ſo commonly, nor, I think, ſo properly, applied to inanimate things.

22. *Have faith in God*, εχετε πιστιν, θεου. That is, ſay ſome, *Have a ſtrong faith.* The words rendered literally are, *Have a faith of God.* And it is a known Hebraiſm, to ſubjoin the words *of God* to a ſubſtantive, to denote great, mighty, excellent; and to an adjective, as the ſign of the ſuperlative. In ſupport of this interpretation, biſhop Pearce has produced a number of paſſages, univerſally explained in this manner. The context here will ſuit either explanation. Though this is a point on which no one ought to be deciſive, I cannot help, upon the whole, preferring the common verſion. My reaſons are theſe which follow: 1ſt, I find that the ſubſtantives conſtrued with θεου, when it ſignifies great or mighty (for it is only with theſe we are here concerned), are names either of real ſubſtances, or of outward and viſible effects. Of the firſt kind are, *prince, mountain, wind, cedar, city*; of the ſecond are, *wreſtling, trembling, ſleep*; but nowhere, as far as I can diſcover, do we find any abſtract quality, ſuch as, faith, hope, love juſtice, truth, mercy, uſed in this manner. When any of theſe words are thus conſtrued with God, he is confeſſedly either the ſubject, or the object, of the affection mentioned. 2dly, The word πιστις, both in the Acts, and in the Epiſtles, is often conſtrued with the genitive of the object, preciſely in the ſame manner as here. Thus, Acts iii. 16. πιστις του ονοματος αυτου is *faith in his* [Chriſt's] *name*; Rom. iii. 22. πιστις Ιησου Χριστου is *faith in Jeſus Chriſt.* See, to the ſame purpoſe, Rom. iii. 26. Gal. ii. 16. 20. iii. 22. Philip. iii. 9. ελπις is uſed in the ſame way, 1 Theſſ. i. 3. As theſe come much nearer the caſe in hand, they are, in my judgment, more than a counterpoiſe to all that has been advanced in favour of the other interpretation.

CHAP. XII.

4. *They wounded in the head with ſtones*, λιθοβολησαντες εκεφαλαιωσαν. Vul. *In capite vulneraverunt.* Agreeably to this verſion, the Cam. and five other MSS. omit λιθοβολησαντες. The Cop. and Sax. tranſlations follow the ſame reading.

14. *Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæſar or not? Shall we give, or ſhall we not give?* εξεστι κηνσον Καισαρι δουναι, ου; δωμεν, η μη δωμεν; Vul. *Licet dare tributum Cæſari, an non dabimus?* with this agree the Go. and the Sax. The Cam. omits the whole clauſe δωμεν, η μη δωμεν;

19. *Moſes*

19. *Moſes hath enacted*, Μωσης εγραψεν. E. T. *Moſes wrote*. The word γραφειν, when applied to legiſlature, and ſpoken of laws, or ſtanding rules, is, both in ſacred uſe and in claſſical, *fancire, to enact*.

29. *The Lord is our God: The Lord is one*, Κυριος ὁ Θεος ἡμων Κυριος εις εστι. E. T. *The Lord our God is one Lord*. The words are a quotation from Moſes, Deut. vi. 4. as rendered by the Seventy. In Heb. they run thus, יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד, literally in Eng. *Jehovah our God Jehovah one*. In ſuch ſentences, there is no ſubſtantive verb in Heb. (as in European languages) to connect the words. Their juxtapoſition is held ſufficient. Sometimes in Gr. and La. which do not labour under the ſame defect, the verb is omitted as unneceſſary. Now, in my apprehenſion (and in this I agree with Vitringa), the words quoted ought to be rendered as two ſentences; in Deut. thus, *Jehovah is our God: Jehovah is one*; and not as one ſentence, *Jehovah our God is one Jehovah*. My reaſons are theſe: 1ſt, It appears to have been the purpoſe of their great legiſlator to eſtabliſh among the people theſe two important articles, as the foundation of that religious conſtitution he was authoriſed to give them. The firſt was, that the God, whom they were to adore, was not any of the acknowledged objects of worſhip in the nations around them, and was, therefore, to be diſtinguiſhed among them, the better to ſecure them againſt ſeduction, by the peculiar name *Jehovah*, by which alone he choſe to be invoked by them. The ſecond was the unity of the divine nature, and conſequently that no pretended divinity (for all other gods were merely pretended) ought to aſſociated with the only true God, or ſhare with him in their adoration. There is an internal probability in this explanation, ariſing from the conſideration that theſe were notoriouſly the fundamental articles of their creed. 2dly, In the reply of the Scribe, v. 32. which was approved by our Lord, and in which he, as it were, echoes every part of the anſwer that had been given to his queſtion, there are two diſtinct affirmations with which he begins; theſe are, *There is one God*, and *there is only one*, correſponding to *the Lord is our God*, and *the Lord is one*. The firſt clauſe, in both declarations, points to the object of worſhip; the ſecond, to the neceſſity of excluding all others. Accordingly, the radical precept relating to this ſubject, quoted by our Lord, Mt. iv. 10. from the Sep. is exactly ſuited to both parts of this declaration. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God*. This may be called the poſitive part of the ſtatute, and correſponds to the article, *The Lord is our God*. *Thou ſhalt ſerve him only*. This is the negative part, and correſponds to the article, *The Lord is one*. 3dly, Such ſhort and ſimple ſentences, without either verb or conjunction to unite them in themſelves, or connect them with one another, are not unfrequent in the ſacred language. An example, perfectly ſimilar, we have, Exod. xv. 3. יהוה איש מלחמה (or, as we read in the Samaritan Pentateuch, יהוה שמו נבור במלחמה) יהוה שמו, rightly rendered in the E. T. as two diſtinct ſentences. *The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name*: by Houbigant, *Dominus eſt bellator fortis; dominus eſt nomen ejus*. 4thly, It is unexampled in ſacred writ, to join אחד as an adjective to a proper name. The caſe is different, when it is affirmed as an attribute, becauſe then the copula or ſubſtantive verb is underſtood. For though the Gr. word κυριος be an appellative, we ought to remember that, in this paſſage, it ſupplies the place of *Jehovah*, a proper name. Now a proper name, which naturally belongs but to one, does not admit numeral adjectives. If ſuch an adjective, therefore, be ſubjoined to the name, it ought to be conſidered as ſomething formally predicated of it, not as an epithet or attendant quality. If the whole purpoſe of the quotation were to aſſert, in one ſentence, the unity of the Godhead, the only natural expreſſion in Heb. would have been יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד, in Gr. κυριος ο Θεος ἡμων Θεος εις εστι. *Jehovah*, or *The Lord, one God is one God*. But as it ſtands, if it had been meant for one ſimple affirmation, the expreſſion would have been both unnatural and improper. The author of the Vul. ſeems from a conviction of this, to have rendered the words, in defiance of the authority of MSS. *Deus unus eſt*. In Deut. he ſays, indeed, *Dominus unus eſt*. But in ſome old editions, previous to the reviſal and corrections of either Sixtus V. or Clement VIII. the reading is, as in Mr. *Deus unus eſt*. I have conſulted two old editions in folio, one printed at Paris 1504, the other at Lyons 1512, both of which read in this manner. Some may ſay, and it is the only objection I can think of, that though my interpretation might ſuit the Heb. of Deut. it does not ſuit the Gr. of the Evangeliſt. We have here the ſubſtantive verb εστι, which, as it is uſed only once in the end, ſeems to connect the whole into one ſentence. I anſwer, that it is not uncommon in the penmen of the N. T. to uſe the copula in the laſt ſhort ſentence or member, and leave it to be ſupplied by the reader's diſcernment in the preceding. Thus, Mt. xi. 30. Ὁ ζυγος μου χρηστος, και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον εστι. Here every body admits, that we have two diſtinct affirmations, and that the εστι, which occurs only in the end, muſt be ſupplied in the former clauſe, after χρηστος.

29. *Our God*, ὁ Θεος ἡμων. Three MSS. read ὑμων; one reads σου. Vul. *Deus tuus*.

34. *Nobody ventured to put queſtions to him*, ουδεις ετολμα αυτον επερωτησαι. E. T. *No man durſt aſk him any queſtion*. Theſe words convey a ſuggeſtion of ſome ſtern prohibition, or terrible menace, denounced by our Lord, which frightened every body from further attempts this way. But this was not the caſe. The people ſaw how completely thoſe were foiled who tried to enſnare him by captious queſtions; and how ill thoſe ſucceeded, who entered into diſputation with him, and were therefore naturally led, from reſpect to a ſuperiority ſo great, and ſo manifeſt, to avoid expo-

fing their own ignorance, or bad intention. This is ſufficiently expreſſed in the verſion. J. xxi. 12. [2] N.

40. *Puniſhment*, κριμα. E. T. *Damnation*. But this word, with us, is confined to the *puniſhment of hell*, to which the impenitent will be hereafter condemned. I think it unwarrantable, in a tranſlator, to limit the words of the ſacred penmen to this meaning, when neither the terms uſed, nor any thing in the context, can be ſaid to limit them. The phraſes κρισις της γεεννης and αιωνιος κρισις, literally, *the puniſhment of hell*, and *eternal puniſhment*, are the only terms in the Goſpels which may be properly rendered *damnation*. And even in theſe I think it preferable, for an obvious reaſon, to uſe the periphraſis of the ſacred writer. By the frequent, unneceſſary, and ſometimes cenſurable, recourſe of tranſlators to the terms, *damned*, *damnation*, *damnable*, and others of like import, an aſperity is given to the language of moſt modern tranſlations of the N. T. which the original evidently has not. Ch. xvi. 16. [3] N.

42. *Two mites, which make a farthing*. Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 10.

CHAP. XIII.

8. *Famines and commotions*, λιμοι και ταραχαι. Vul. *Fames*. The Cop. Sax. and Eth. read as the Vul. Και ταραχαι are wanting in the Cam. and one other MS.

9. *To bear teſtimony to them*, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. E. T. *For a teſtimony againſt them*. Thus alſo, Mt. x. 18. εις μαρτυριον αυτοις και τοις εθνεσι. E. T. renders, *For a teſtimony againſt them and the Gentiles*. But, in Mt. xxiv. 14. εις μαρτυριον πασι τοις εθνεσι is tranſlated, *For a witneſs unto all nations*. This is evidently the moſt natural interpretation, and ſuits the uſual import of the dative caſe. Nor is there aught in the context of any of the three paſſages that would lead one to interpret it differently from the reſt. The change conſequently appears capricious. In one place indeed, namely, ch. vi. 11. the words in connection ſufficiently warrant the change of the prepoſition. But that the conſtruction there is rather unuſual, may be concluded from the parallel paſſage, L. ix. 5. where the words are, εις μαρτυριον επ' αυτους, a phraſe which occurs in no other part of the Goſpel. Be. was the firſt tranſlator who, in the verſe under review, introduced the prepoſition *adverſus*.

11. *Have no anxiety beforehand, nor premeditate what ye ſhall ſpeak*, μη προμεριμνατε τι λαλησητε, μηδε μελετατε. Vul. *Nolite præcogitare quid loquamini*. The latter clauſe, anſwering to μηδε μελετατε is wanting here, and in the Cop. and Sax. verſions. So it is alſo in the Cam. and four other MSS.

[1] *Foretold by the prophet Daniel*, το ρηθεν υπο Δανιηλ του προφητου. This clauſe is not in the Cam. and three other MSS. of ſome note. It is wanting alſo in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Arm. verſions.

32. *Or*. The common Gr. copies have και; but if we judge from the value, as well as number, of MSS. which read ν, and from the ſupport this reading has in the ancient writers and verſions, we cannot heſitate to admit it as genuine.

[2] *Hour*, ωρας. This word may be rendered *ſeaſon*. Mt. viii. 13. N.

35. *In the evening*—Theſe are the four night watches, anſwering with us to the hours of nine and twelve at night, three and ſix in the morning.

CHAP. XIV.

3. *Of ſpikenard*, ναρδου πιστικης. Vul. *Nardi ſpicati*. Critics have been divided about the exact import of this term. Some have thought that it has ariſen from the La. name *nardus ſpicatus*, the latter part of which denoting the ſpecies of the plant, has, by ſome accident, been corrupted into πιστικης. Others conſider this word only as an epithet, expreſſive of the purity or fineneſs of the balſam. In the former way the Vul. tranſlates it, in the latter the Sy. As in meaning, however, they pretty much coincide, the *ſpikenard* being accounted the moſt precious kind of *nard*; it ſeemed better to make no alteration on the word which our tranſlators have adopted from the Vul.

[2] *She broke open the box*, συντριψασα το αλαβαστρον. E. T. *She brake the box*. Some late tranſlators, not ſeeing any neceſſity for breaktng the box in order to get out the liquor, have choſen to ſay *ſhook*. Blackwall (Sac. Claſ. vol. ii. p. ii. ch. 3.) thinks that the breaking refers to the parts of the liquor, which would be ſo ſeparated by ſhaking, as to diffuſe their fragrance wider, and flow eaſier. Συντριζειν, I acknowledge, does not always mean *to break*; perhaps oftener *to bruiſe*. Συντριζεσθαι, however, always implies that there is violence, and that the thing ſpoken of has ſuſtained damage. Now it is evident, that it is not the liquor to which the verb is applied, but the box. For though, by a common figure, the containing for the contained, the box might be uſed to denote the liquor; theſe two are here ſo contradiſtinguiſhed, that the trope can hardly have place. The hiſtorian had told us, that the woman had αλαβαστρον μυρε ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους. After naming the box, the liquor is ſpecified. To this, as being laſt mentioned, the participle συντριψασα might refer, if nothing were ſubjoined; but the repetition of αλαβαστρον after συντριψασα, ought, by the ſyntactic order, expreſsly to exclude that interpretation; as it could be intended only to prevent a wrong reference to μυρον. The συντριψασα, therefore, whatever it denotes, muſt regularly refer to the box. This, ſay they, is not the uſual method of taking out the liquor; but it may be ſometimes a neceſſary method. Nor does it follow, as a conſequence of breaking the box, that the liquor muſt be loſt. The effect would depend entirely on the form

of

of the veſſel, and the manner of breaking it. We may ſtrike off the neck of a bottle or flaggon, without ſpilling the liquor. I have, however, choſen the words *broke open*, as ſufficiently denoting that it required an uncommon effort to bring out the contents, which is all that the word here neceſſarily implies. And it is a circumſtance that ought not to be altogether overlooked, being an additional evidence of the woman's zeal for doing honour to her Lord. That the term ought not to be rendered *ſhook*, is to me evident. I know no example of it in this meaning in any author, ſacred or profane. Verbs denoting *to ſhake*, frequently occur in ſcripture. But the word is never συντριζω, but τινασσω, σειω, σαλευω.

14. *The gueſt-chamber*, το καταλυμα. L. ii. 7. 3. N.

15. *Furniſhed*, εστρωμενον. I have followed the E. T. in rendering the Gr. word by a general term. To make a ſtricter interpretation intelligible to ordinary readers, would require more circumlocution than it would be proper to introduce into ſo ſimple a narrative. The Eng. word, which comes neareſt the import of the Gr. is *carpeted*. But when this term is uſed, as here, of a dining-room, it is not meant (as without an explanation would occur to us) only of the floor, but of the couches on which the gueſts reclined at meals. On theſe they were wont, for the ſake both of neatneſs and of conveniency, to ſpread a coverlet or carpet. As this was commonly the laſt thing they did in dreſſing the room, it may not improperly be employed to denote the whole.

22. *Take, eat, this is my body*, λαβετε, φαγετε, τουτο εστι το σωμα μου. Vul. *Sumite, hoc eſt corpus meum*. The ſame defect is in both the Sy. the Cop. the Ara. the Sax. and the Eth. verſions. The Al. and ſome other noted MSS. omit φαγετε.

30. *Even thou*. Though, in the common Gr. we have not the pronoun συ after ὁτι, it is found in ſo great a number of MSS. Many of them of principal note, in ſo many ancient verſions, fathers, and early editions, that it has been generally received by critics. That συ is emphatical in this place there can be no doubt. Peter's ſolemn declaration ended with theſe words, αλλ' κὰ εγω. Our Lord's words ὁτι συ ſtand directly oppoſed to them. It may be added, that the pronoun, in the learned languages, being in ſuch caſes unneceſſary for expreſſing the ſenſe, becauſe its power is included in the verb, is hardly ever mentioned but with an emphaſis, which can rarely be tranſlated into modern tongues without the aid of ſome particle, as here of the adverb *even*.

41. *All is over*, απεχει. E. T. *It is enough*. This expreſſion is here both indefinite and obſcure. L. Cl.'s verſion is neareſt the point, *C'eſt une affaire faite*, or An. *'Tis done*. The intention was manifeſtly to ſignify that the time wherein they might have been of uſe to him by their counſel and comfort was now loſt; and that he was in a manner already in the hands of his enemies.

43. *Clubs*. L. xxii. 52. N.

51. *Who had only a linen cloth wrapt about his body*, περιβεβλημενος σινδονα επι γυμνου. E. T. *Having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body*. Biſhop Pearce ſuppoſes this to have been a tunic, or veſtcoat, the garment worn next the ſkin (for ſhirts, as neceſſary as we imagine them, appear to be of a later date, unleſs we give that name to a linen tunic); but the words in connection, περιβεβλημενος επι γυμνου, lead us to think that this was a looſe cloth caſt careleſsly about him. The hiſtorian would never have added επι γυμνου, ſpeaking of the tunic, or, as we commonly render it, *coat*, which was always επι γυμνου, cloſe to the body. By this, on the contrary, he ſignifies that the man had on no tunic, and was conſequently obliged to make his eſcape naked, when they pulled of his wrapper. Beſides, a man's appearing only in his tunic was nothing extraordinary, and would never have excited the attention of the ſoldiers. The common people, on ordinary occaſions, or when employed in manual labour, ſeldom appeared otherwiſe. What our Lord ſays, ch. xiii. 16. *Let not him who ſhall be in the field turn back to fetch his mantle*, is an evidence of this; for theſe two, *the tunic* and *the mantle*, completed their dreſs.

52. *The ſoldiers*, οι νεανισκοι. E. T. *The young men*. A common denomination for ſoldiers among the Greeks. Though this incident, recorded by Mr. may not appear of great moment, it is, in my opinion, one of thoſe circumſtances we call pictureſque, which, though in a manner unconnected with the ſtory, enlivens the narrative, and adds to its credibility. It muſt have been late in the night, when (as has been very probably conjectured) ſome young man, whoſe houſe lay near the garden, being rouſed out of ſleep by the noiſe of the ſoldiers and armed retinue paſſing by, got up, ſtimulated by curioſity, wrapt himſelf (as Caſaubon ſuppoſes) in the cloth in which he had been ſleeping, and ran after them. This is ſuch an incident as is very likely to have happened, but moſt unlikely to have been invented.

53. *All the chief prieſts*, παντες οι αρχιερεις. Vul. *Omnes ſacerdotes*. The interpreter ſeems to have read ιερεις. But this reading is not warranted by any MS. or verſion, except the Sax.

56. *Were inſufficient*, ισαι κὰ ησαν. E. T. *Agreed not together*. Vul. *Convenientia teſtimonia non erant*. Between theſe two ways of rendering this paſſage, tranſlators have been divided. Er. and Zu. are the only Lat. tranſlators I have ſeen who agree with that here given, *nec erant ſatis idonea*. The Fr. tranſlations alſo of P. R. L. Cl. and Beau. the Eng. An. and Weſ. concur with mine. On a doubtful point, where the words appear ſuſceptible of either interpretation, one ought to be determined by the circumſtances of the caſe. Now there

there is nothing, in the whole narrative, that insinuates the smallest discrepancy among the witnesses. On the contrary, in the Gospels, the testimony specified is mentioned as given by all the witnesses. The differences in Mt. and Mr. one saying, *I will rebuild* another *I can rebuild*; one adding, *made with hands*, another omitting it, not only are of no moment in themselves, but are manifestly differences in the reports of the Evangelists, not in the testimony of the witnesses; nor are they greater than those which occur in most other facts related from memory. What therefore perplexed the pontiffs and the scribes, was that, admitting all that was attested, it did not amount to what could be accounted a capital crime. This made the high-priest think of extorting from our Lord's mouth, a confession which might supply the defect of evidence. This expedient succeeded to their wish. Jesus, though not outwitted by their subtility, was no way disposed to decline suffering, and, therefore readily supplied them with the pretext they wanted.

59. *Definitive.* See the last note.

61. *The Son of the blessed One,* ὁ υἱος τ ευλογητ. Vul. *Filius Dei benedicti.* In the Al. and two other MSS. we read θυ τ ευλογητ. But it is entirely suitable to the Heb. idiom, to employ the adjective ευλογητ@., without the noun, as a distinguishing appellation of God.

72. *He reflected thereon with tears,* επιβαλων εκλαιε. E. T. *When he thought thereon, he wept.* There are not many words in Scripture which have undergone more interpretations than this term, επιβαλων. The Vul. perhaps from a different reading, followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Cal. says, *Cœpit flere.* In this also agree the Sy. the Sax. and the Go. versions. Ar. *Separans se flevit.* Be. *Quum se proripuisset, flevit.* Dio. *Si mise a plangere.* G. F. after Be. *S'estant jetté hors il pleura.* P. R. Beau. and L. Cl. as Dio. *Il se mit a pleurer.* Hey. *He burst into tears.* Almost all our other Eng. versions of this century, An. Dod. Wes. Wor. Wy. have it, *He covered his head,* or *his face and wept.* Schmidius and Raphelius have, warmly, but not, in my judgment, successfully, defended Be.'s version, making επιβαλλειν to mean, *se foras proripere sive ejicere, to rush out.* Elsner has clearly shown, that the examples produced in support of this interpretation, conclude nothing; and that the word, as its etymology suggests, denotes, more properly, *to rush in,* than *to rush out.* Accordingly, when it is construed with a preposition, the preposition is always εις or επι, never εξ or απο. He, therefore, prefers an explanation which had been first given by The. and afterwards defended by Salmasius, and others: *Having covered his head, he wept.* Yet the Gr. commentator does not give this as the certain meaning of the word; but mentions two interpretations, leaving it to the reader to make his choice. His words are, επιβαλων, ἡ αντι τ, επικαλυψαμενος τον καρα, ἡ αντι τ, εξεμυσε μετα σφοδροτητος. But has any authority been produced for rendering επιβαλλειν, by itself, *to cover the head?* The authority of The. himself, a writer of the eleventh century, especially on a point of which he is evidently doubtful, will not go far. Pains have been taken to evince that the Greeks and Romans (for nothing, if I remember right, has been affirmed of the Jews) had such a custom; but not that it was ever expressed by the single word επιβαλλω. It is very natural in a man who weeps, to endeavour to hide his face; not so much to conceal his emotion, as to conceal the effect of it, the distortion it brings upon his countenance. But the matter of consequence to Peter, was to conceal his emotion altogether. Now, he could not have taken a more effectual method of publishing it to all around him, than by muffling up his head in his mantle. This could not fail to attract the attention of many who had no opportunity of observing the change on his features. I consider the version of this word in Dio. Beau. and L. Cl. as made from the Vul. or the Cam. the only Gr. copy which reads εξεκλαιεν. Hey's seems to be a free version of The.'s εξεμυσε μετα σφοδροτητος, εκλαιε. In regard to what appears to have been the oldest manner of translating the word επιβαλων, *he began;* I should, with Palairet, have no objection to it, had the words been επιβαλε κλαιειν, and not επιβαλων εκλαιε; for, though no phrase in Scripture is more common, than *he began to do,* for *he did;* we do not find a single instance in which the first verb is expressed by the participle, and the second by the indicative mood (I might add, or in which επιβαλλειν is used for *to begin);* now the form, in idiomatic phrases, must be carefully observed, for they hardly ever convey the same sense, when differently construed. Simon of the Oratory, after Gro. makes this participle equivalent to the Heb. יסף *addens.* But it is remarkable, that though the verb επιβαλλω occurs very often in the version of the Seventy, they have not once used it in translating the Heb. אסף which is a very common verb. Palairet follows Ham. who has given a version which differs from all the preceding, *He look'd upon him* [Jesus], *and wept.* But our former question recurs, Where do we find επιβαλλω, without any addition, used in this sense? Not one quotation where the verb is not followed by οφθαλμος, οψις, or ομματα, has been brought in support of this meaning. The meanings would be endless which might be given it, should we form an interpretation from every word that may be construed with επιβαλλω. After weighing, impartially, the above and other explanations, I think, with Wet. that the sense exhibited by the E. T. is the most probable. That there is an ellipsis in the words, is undeniable. Now, we can never plead use in favour of a particular signification of an elliptic term, but when we can show that such is the meaning of the word where there is the same ellipsis. To say επιβαλλειν means *to look upon,* because επιβαλλειν οφθαλμος has that meaning; or that it signifies *to cover the face,* because βαλλειν φαρη επ' ομματων has that signification, appears to me so extraordinary a mode of reasoning, that I am surprised

to find critics of undoubted learning and diſcernment adopting it. If I ſhould produce examples of επιζαλλειν τον νουν, or την διανοιαν, as ſignifying to think of a thing, to reflect upon it, than which nothing is eaſier; I ſhould give full as much probability to this ſignification of the word επιζαλλειν, when alone, as has been given by any quotations I have yet ſeen, to the moſt plauſible of the meanings above mentioned. But more can be ſaid here. The verb by itſelf is explained by Phavorinus, as admitting this interpretation. Επιζαλλει ει τις ονοματι η εργω, ηγουν ακριζωμενος και επιτυχως νοει, ο και επιζολως φαμεν. Suidas explains επιζολη by νοησις. And of the word uſed ſingly in this acceptation, Wet. has produced clear examples from Polybius, Theophraſtus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Diogenes Laertius, and ſeveral others, to which I refer the learned reader; and ſhall only add, that if theſe authorities do not put the matter beyond all queſtion, they, at leaſt, give it a greater probability than has been yet given to any of the other hypotheſes.

CHAP. XV.

5. *Anſwered no more*, ουκετι ουδεν απεκριθη. E. T. *Yet anſwered nothing.* But this implies that he had anſwered nothing to the former queſtion; the reverſe of which is the fact, as appears, v. 2. and is juſtly obſerved by biſhop Pearce. All the La. tranſlators ſay rightly, *Nihil amplius reſpondit*, or what is manifeſtly equivalent. All the foreign tranſlations, I have ſeen, give the ſame ſenſe. Yet, to ſhow how difficult it is to preſerve an uniform attention, and how liable, at times, even judicious perſons are to run blindfold into the errors of their predeceſſors, it may be obſerved, that Weſ. is the only modern Eng. tranſlator who has eſcaped a blunder, not more repugnant to the fact, as recorded in the verſes immediately preceding, than contradictory to the import of the Gr. expreſſion here uſed. His verſion is, *Anſwered nothing any more.* The reſt, without exception, ſay, *Still anſwered nothing*, or words to that purpoſe, Yet, in the tranſlation commonly uſed in queen Elizabeth's reign, the ſenſe was truly exhibited, *Anſwered no more at all.*

8. *With clamour the multitude demanded*, Αναβοησας ο οχλος ηρξατο αιτεισθαι. Vul. *Cum aſcendiſſet turba cœpit rogare.* Accordingly, the Vat. MS. has αναβας for αναβοησας. Agreeable to which are alſo the Cop. and Eth. verſions. The Cam. reads αναβας ολος, and is followed by the Go. but not by the Sax. which has nothing anſwering to the firſt clauſe, *Cum aſcendiſſet*, but is, in what follows, conformable to the Vul.

12. *What then would ye have me do with him whom ye call the king of the Jews?* Τι ουν θελετε ποιησω ον λεγετε βασιλεα των Ιουδαιων; Vul. *Quid ergo vultis faciam regi Judæorum?* But in this the Vul. is in a manner ſingular. There is no Gr. MS. known as yet, which has not ον λεγετε: no other verſion, except the Sax. which does not tranſlate it.

25. *Nailed him to the croſs*, εσταυρωσαν αυτον. E. T. *Crucified him.* The Eng. verb, *to crucify*, denotes, properly, to put to death by nailing to the croſs. The word σταυροω, here, means no more than *to faſten to the croſs with nails.* In ſtrict propriety, we ſhould not ſay a man cried out after he was crucified, but after he was nailed to the croſs.

25. *The third hour.* J. xix. 14. N.

34. *Eloi*, ελωι. This is the Sy. as well as the Heb. word for *my God.* See J. xx. 17. in the Sy. verſion. It is there pronounced *Elohi*: but the aſpiration muſt be dropt, when written in Gr. letters, as it ſuits not the analogy of the Gr. language, to admit it in the middle, or at the end, of a word. For this reaſon they ſay *Abraam*, not *Abraham.*

42. *When it was evening*, και ηδη οψιας γενομενης. The word anſwering to *evening* is uſed with ſome latitude in Scripture. The Jews ſpoke of two evenings, Mt. xiv. 23. N. It is probably the former of theſe that is meant here, and Mt. xxvii. 57. for at ſix *the preparation ended*, and *the Sabbath* began, when they durſt no longer be ſo employed.

44. *Pilate, amazed that he was ſo ſoon dead*, ο δε Πιλατος εθαυμασεν, ει ηδη τεθνηκε. E. T. *And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead.* Raphelius, with whom agrees biſhop Pearce, has ſhown, by examples from Xenophon and Euſebius, that the conjunction ει is, in ſome caſes, properly tranſlated *that.* We have a ſtrong evidence that this is the meaning here, from the queſtion put to the centurion, *whether Jeſus had been dead*, ποσαι, *any time*, not ηδη, *already.* That there are two MSS. which read ηδη, is, perhaps, not worth mentioning.

CHAP. XVI.

2. *About ſun-riſe*, ανατειλαντος του ηλιου. E. T. *At the riſing of the ſun.* Vul. *Orto jam ſole.* This expreſſes too much; for let it be obſerved, that it is not the preterperfect participle that is here uſed by the Evangeliſt, but an aoriſt. Nor is there a word in the Gr. (except in a very few copies) nor in any other ancient verſion, anſwering to *jam* in the La. The E. T. ſeems, in this place, to follow the Cam. which reads ανατελλοντος in the preſent. But this reading is peculiar to that copy.

8. *Getting out, fled*, εξελθουσαι ταχυ εφυγον. E. T. *Went out quickly, and fled.* But the word ταχυ is wanting in a great number of MSS. ſome of them of principal note, in ſeveral of the beſt editions, and ancient verſions, particularly the Vul. and both the Sy. It is alſo rejected by Mill and Wet.

16. *He who shall believe*, ὁ πιστευσας. E. T. *He who believeth.* The Gr. aorists have not always the power of the preterite; but, agreeably to the import of the name, are frequently indefinite in regard to time. Here they are better rendered by the present, as in the E. T. than by the past; the present, with us, being often used indefinitely. Had the words immediately preceding related to a judgment to come, the most proper tense, here, in Eng. for expressing the Gr. aorist, would have been the future perfect; that is, a future which is past, in respect of another future referred to. *He who shall have believed, shall be saved.* In this manner all the La. translators, except Ar. have expressed it: *Qui credidérit.* But, as the words immediately preceding are an order with which the words of this passage are connected, as regarding what is necessarily consequent on the execution of that order (for of necessity they would be either believed or disbelieved), the time is, in our idiom, best expressed by a simple future. Though the future perfect could not be accounted improper, it is so complex [*He who shall have believed, and shall have been baptized*], that, unless where perspecuity renders it necessary, it is better to avoid it. The later Fr. translators, (though that tense be, in their language, a degree simpler than in ours) take this method. P. R. Sa. and Si. though translating from the Vul. and Beau. say, *Celui qui croira*, not *qui aura cru.*

16. *He who shall believe—he who will not believe*, ὁ πιστευσας—ὁ απιστησας. E. T. *He that believeth—he that believeth not.* The change of the future from *shall* to *will*, may, to a superficial view, appear capricious; but I imagine the idiom of the language requires this distinction, between a positive and a negative condition. It is accordingly expressed in the same manner in the old Eng. version formerly quoted. A sovereign might properly say to his minister, 'Publish, in my name, this edict to the people; if they shall obey it, they shall be rewarded, 'but if they will not obey, they shall be punished.' In the former part of the declaration, it is not the will that is required, so much as the performance: in the latter part, a threat is annexed to the non-performance, merely on account of the obstinacy, that is, pravity, of will by which it is occasioned. This distinction particularly suits the nature of the present case. The belief that results not from evidence, but from an inclination to believe, is not styled *faith*, so properly as *credulity*, which is always accounted an extreme. Nor is that *unbelief*, or even *disbelief*, criminal, that is not justly imputable to a *disinclination* to believe, in spite of evidence, which is termed *incredulity*, and is as much an extreme as the other. It is required, not that our will operate in producing belief (ample evidence is afforded for this purpose, as mentioned in the two subsequent verses), but that our will do not operate in a contrary direction, to prevent or obstruct our believing. God alone gives light, he requires of us only that we do not shut our eyes against it. It may be thought an objection to this explanation, that it would imply, that there is a *demerit* in the unbelief that is punishable, at the same time that there is no *merit* in the faith that is to be rewarded. This is doubtless the case. There is no positive *merit* in faith; and if, when compared with infidelity, there may be ascribed to it a sort of negative merit, the term is evidently used in a sense not strictly proper. But this is no objection to the explanation given above. These contraries do not stand on a footing entirely similar. Death, we know, is the wages of sin; but eternal life, which is the same with salvation, is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

16. *Shall be condemned*, κατακριθησεται. E. T. *shall be damned.* But this is not a just version of the Gr. word. The term *damned*, with us, relates solely to the doom that shall be pronounced upon the wicked at the last day. This cannot be affirmed, with truth, of the Gr. κατακρινω, which corresponds exactly to the Eng. verb *condemn.* It may relate to that future sentence, and it may not. All the La. translations I know, Vul. Ar. Zu. Er. Cas. Cal. Be. say, *condemnabitur.* But if the word had been *damnabitur*, it would have made no difference, as these two La. verbs are synonymous. It is not so with the Eng. words, *to damn*, and *to condemn.* I cannot help observing, that though the Itn. and Fr. languages have verbs exactly corresponding, in the difference of their meanings, to the two Eng. verbs, their translators have, very properly, preferred the more general term. Dio. says, *Sara condemnato:* G. F. L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Si. Sa. *Sera condamné.* In regard to the more modern Eng. versions, they have all replaced the proper word *condemned*, except Wes. who retains the term of the common translation. Ch xii. 43. N.

Jerom has observed, that there were few of the Gr. copies, he had seen, which had the last twelve verses of this chapter. They are still wanting in many MSS. and are not comprehended in the canons of Eusebius. But they are in the Sy. version, the Ara. and the Vul. and were in the old Itc. and other ancient versions. They are in the Al. and Cam. MSS. They are, also, in The.'s Commentaries. But what weighs most with me, I acknowledge, is, that the manner wherein so ancient a writer as Ireneus, in the second century, refers to this Gospel, renders it highly probable that the whole passage was read in all the copies known to him. *In fine autem evangelii, ait Marcus, "Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cælos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei."* Adv. Hær. lib. iii. cap. 11. The verse quoted is the nineteenth, and the chapter has but twenty. It deserves our notice, that there is not a single MSS. which has this verse, that has not, also, the whole passage from the eighth to the end; nor is there a MS. which wants

wants this verſe, that does not alſo want the whole. No authority, of equal antiquity, has yet been produced upon the other ſide. It has been conjectured, and the difficulty of reconciling the account, here given, of our Lord's appearances, after his reſurrection, with thoſe of the other Evangeliſts, has emboldened ſome tranſcribers to omit them. The plauſibility of this conjecture, the abruptneſs of the concluſion of this hiſtory, without the words in queſtion, and the want of any thing like a reaſon for adding them, if they had not been there originally, render their authenticity, at leaſt, probable. Tranſcribers ſometimes preſume to add and alter, in order to remove contradictions, but not, as far as I can remember, in order to make them

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY LUKE.

CHAP. I.

1. *THINGS which have been accomplished amongst us,* των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων. E. T. *Things which are most surely believed among us.* Vul. *Quæ in nobis completæ sunt rerum.* Lu. **Do under uns ergangen sind.** Be. *Rerum quarum plena fides nobis facta est.* As the greater part of modern interpreters, who have written since, both abroad and at home, adopt, with Be. the latter method of translating, it is proper to assign my reasons for joining Lu. Ham. and the few who, with the Vul. prefer the former. The verb πληροφορεω admits, in Scripture, two interpretations. One is, *to perform, fulfil,* or *accomplish;* the other, *to convince, persuade,* or *embolden,* that is, to inspire with that confidence which is commonly consequent upon conviction; and hence the noun πληροφορια denotes *conviction, assurance, confidence.* The passive πληροφορεομαι is accordingly either *to be performed,* &c. or *to be convinced,* &c. Now, as it is only of things that we can say, 'They 'are performed,' and of persons, 'They are convinced,' ther can be little doubt, in any occurrence, about the signification of the word. But, in the way in which Be. and others have rendered this verse, neither of these senses is given to the term. That they have purposely avoided the first signification, they acknowledge; nor can it be denied that, aware of the absurdity of speaking of things being *convinced, persuaded,* or *emboldened,* they have eluded the second. For this reason, they have adopted some term nearly related to this meaning, but not coincident with it, or have disguised the deviation by a periphrasis. Our translators have rendered πεπληροφορημενων *most surely believed,* after Er. *quæ certissimæ fidei sunt.* But where do we find πληροφορεω signifying *to believe?* Not in Scripture, I suspect: but that we may not decide rashly, let us examine the places where the word occurs. Paul says, concerning Abraham (Rom. iv. 21.), πληροφορηθεις οτι ὁ επηγγελται [ὁ Θεος] δυνατος εστι και ποιησαι, *being convinced that God is able to perform what he hath promised.* Again, in recommending to the Romans moderation and tolerance towards one another, as to days and meats, of which some made distinctions, and others did not, he says (Rom. xiv. 5), εκαστος εν τω ιδιω νοι πληροφορεισθω, *Let every man be convinced in his own mind.* If in such points he act upon conviction, though erroneous, it is enough. As in both these it is to persons that this quality is attributed, there has never been any doubt about the meaning. Only we may remark, upon the last example, that it is a direct confutation of what Be. affirms in his notes on L. to be the import of the word, namely, that it implies not the conviction produced, but the full sufficiency of the evidence given. Το πληροφορεισθαι, says he, *ad res accommodatum, res significat ita certis testimoniis comprobatus, ut de iis ambigi meritò non possit.* Again, *Nec enim hic dictum voluit Lucas fuisse certam ab auditoribus adhibitam Evangelicæ doctrinæ fidem, sed ea sese scripturum de Christi dictis et factis, quæ certissimis testimoniis vera esse constitisset.* Now, in the passage quoted, we find it applied alike to the persuasion of opposite opinions, to wit, that there ought, and that there ought not, to be made a distinction of days and meats. Now, as two contradictory opinions cannot be both true, neither can both be supported by irrefragable evidence. Yet the Apostle

 says,

ſays, concerning both, πληροφορηθω εκαστος. The term, therefore, has no relation to the ſtrength or weakneſs of the evidence; it ſolely expreſſes the conviction produced in the mind, whether by real evidence, or by what only appears ſuch. Though both, therefore, deviate, the E. T. deviates leſs than Be. But to return: there are alſo in Paul's Epiſtles two examples of this verb applied to things. He ſays to Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 5.), την διακονιαν σου πληροφορησον, *fulfil thy miniſtry*, agreeably to the rendering of the Vul. *miniſterium tuum imple*, and of all the antient tranſlations. Be. in conformity to his own explanation of the word, *miniſterii tui plenam fidem facito*, literally rendered by our interpreters, *make full proof of thy miniſtry*, as though it were not ſo much an object to a Chriſtian miniſter to diſcharge his duty, as to approve himſelf to men; whereas, the former is certainly the primary object, the latter but a ſecondary one at the beſt. This manner is, beſides, worſe adapted than the other, both to the ſpirit of Chriſtian morality, which, inſpiring with a ſuperiority to the opinions of fallible men, fixes the attention on the unerring judgment of God; and to the ſimplicity of the apoſtolical injunctions. The only other paſſage is in the ſame chapter (v. 17.), Ὁ δε Κυριος μοι παρεστη, και ενεδυναμωσε με, ινα δι' εμου το κηρυγμα πληροφορηθη. The laſt clauſe is rendered by the Vul. *ut per me prædicatio impleatur, that by me the preaching may be accompliſhed.* Be. after his manner, *ut per me plenè certioraretur præconium*, and after him the E. T. *that by me the preaching might be fully known.* This method has here the additional diſadvantage, that it makes the next clauſe a repetition of the ſentiment in other words, and *that all the Gentiles might hear.* Er. has been ſo ſenſible of this, that he has deſerted his ordinary manner, and ſaid, *ut per me præconium expleretur.* The word occurs only once in the Sep. and, as it is applied to perſons, it ſignifies, *perſuaded, emboldened*, (Eccl. viii. 11.) δια τουτο επληροφορηθη καρδια υιων των ανθρωπων εν αυτοις του ποιησαι το πονηρον, *Therefore the heart of the ſons of men is emboldened to do evil.* It anſwers in this place to the Heb. מלא *mala*, uſually rendered πληροω. I ſhall only add, that the ſenſe here aſſigned is better ſuited to the ſpirit and tenor of theſe hiſtories, than the other. A ſimple narration of the facts is given; but no attempt is made, by argument, aſſeveration, or animated expreſſion, to bias the underſtanding, or work upon the paſſions. The naked truth is left to its own native evidence. The writers betray no ſuſpicion of its inſufficiency. This method of theirs has more of genuine dignity than the other, and, if I miſtake not, has been productive of more durable conſequences than ever yet reſulted from the arts of rhetoricians, and the enticing words of man's wiſdom.

2. *Afterwards miniſters of the word*, υπηρεται γενομενοι του λογου. Vul. *Miniſtri fuerunt ſermonis.* I have here alſo preferred the rendering of the Vul. to that of ſome modern La. interpreters, who have given a very different ſenſe to the expreſſion. In this I am happy in the concurrence of our tranſlators, who have, in oppoſition to Be. followed the old interpreter. However, as the authorities on the other ſide are conſiderable, it is proper to aſſign the reaſons of this preference. There are three ſenſes which have been put upon the words. Firſt, by ὁ λογος, ſome have thought that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is meant, who is ſometimes ſo denominated by John. But this opinion is quite improbable, in as much as the idiom is peculiar to the Apoſtle. And even if this were the meaning of the word here, it ought not to be differently tranſlated, becauſe *miniſters of the word* is juſt as much fitted for conveying it in Eng. as υπηρεται του λογου is in Gr. The Eng. name is neither more ſeldom nor leſs plainly given him in the tranſlation, than the Gr. name is given him in the original. If there be any obſcurity or ambiguity in the one, there is the ſame in the other. The ſecond meaning is that which moſt modern interpreters have adopted, who render του λογου *the thing*, not *the word*; ſuppoſing it to denote the ſame with πραγματων in the preceding verſe; and underſtand by υπηρεται thoſe concerned in the events, either as ſubordinate agents in effecting them, or as partakers in their immediate conſequences. Thus Be. *adminiſtri ipſius rei*; Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe, *adminiſtratores rei*; Er. followed by the interpreter of Zu. more in the ſtyle of Virgil than of Luke, *qui pars aliqua eorum fuerant*; and theſe have had their imitators among the tranſlators into modern languages. Now my reaſons for not adopting this manner, which is ſupported by expoſitors of great name, are the following: 1ſt, If λογος had meant here (as I acknowledge it often does) *thing*, not *word*, it would have been in the plural number, as πραγματων is, which relates to the ſame events, things ſo multifarious as to include whatever Jeſus did, or ſaid, or ſuffered. 2dly, When the word λογος, in the fourth verſe, is actually uſed in this meaning, having the ſame reference as πραγμα to the things accompliſhed, it is in the plural. Λογος, therefore, in the ſingular in this acceptation in the ſecond verſe, would not be more repugnant to propriety than to the conſtruction both of the preceding part of the ſentence and of the following. 3dly, I am as little ſatisfied as to the propriety of the word υπηρεται in that interpretation. Υπηρετης denotes properly *miniſter, ſervant*, or *agent*, employed by another in the performance of any work. But in what ſenſe the Apoſtles or other diſciples could be called *miniſters* or *agents* in the much greater part of thoſe events, whereof the Goſpel gives us a detail, I have no conception. The principal things are what happened to our Lord, his miraculous conception and divine original, the manifeſt interpoſition of the Deity at his baptiſm and tranſfiguration, alſo his trial, death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion. In theſe ſurely they had no agency or miniſtry whatever. As to the miracles which he performed, and the diſcourſes which he ſpoke; the moſt that can be ſaid of the Apoſtles, is, that they ſaw the one, and heard the other. Nor could any little ſervice in ordinary matters, ſuch as diſtributing the loaves and fiſhes to the multitude, making preparation for the paſſover, or even the extraordinary powers by which they were enabled to perform

perform ſome miracles, not recorded in the Goſpels, entitle them to be ſtyled ὑπηρεται αν πεπληροφορημενων εν ἡμιν πραγματων, of which alone the Goſpels are the hiſtories; and for expreſſing their participation in the immediate effects of what they witneſſed, the tem ὑπηρεται appears to me quite unſuitable. So much for the rejection of that interpretation, though favoured by Gro. and Ham. My reaſons for adopting the other are theſe: *The word of God*, ὁ λογος του Θεου, was, with Jew as well as Chriſtians, a common expreſſion for whatever God communicates to men for their inſtruction, whether doctrines or precepts. Thus our Lord, in explaining the parable of the ſower, informs us that the ſeed denotes *the word of God*, ὁ λογος του Θεου (L. viii. 11.) In what follows of the explanation, and in the other Goſpels, it is ſtyled ſimply *the word*. Thus (Mr. iv. 14.), Ὁ σπειρων τον λογον σπειρει, *The ſower*, which is explained to mean the preacher, *ſoweth the word*. Hence, among Chriſtians, it came frequently to denote the Goſpel, the laſt, and the beſt, revelation of God's will to men. Nor is this idiom more familiar to any of the ſacred writers than to L. See the following paſſages; L. viii. 12, 13. 15. Acts iv. 4. vi. 4. viii. 4. x. 44. xi. 19. xiv. 25. xvi. 6. xvii. 11. For brevity's ſake, I have produced thoſe places only wherein the abriged form, ὁ λογος, *the word*, is uſed as in the text. I cannot help obſerving that in one of the paſſages above quoted, Acts vi. 4. the phraſe is ἡ διακονια του λογου, *the miniſtry of the word*. This is mentioned as being eminently the buſineſs of the Apoſtles, and oppoſed to διακονια τραπεζων, *the ſervice of tables*, an inferior ſort of miniſtry, which was ſoon to be committed to a ſet of ſtewards elected for the purpoſe. Who knows not that ὑπηρετης and διακονος are, for the moſt part, in the Acts and Epiſtles uſed indiſcriminately for a miniſter of religion? It is impoſſible, therefore, on reflection, to heſitate a moment in affirming, that the hiſtorian here meant to aquaint us, that he had received his information from thoſe that had attended Jeſus, and been witneſſes of every thing during his public miniſtration upon the earth, and who, after his aſcenſion, had been entruſted by him with the charge of propagating his doctrine throughout the world. *Spectators* firſt, *miniſters* afterwards.

3. *Having exactly traced every thing*, παρηκολουθηκοτι ασιν ακριβως. E. T. *Having had perfect underſtanding of all things*. The words in the original expreſs more than is comprized in the common verſion. By the active verb παρακολουθεω, joined with the adverb ακριβως, are ſuggeſted his diligence and attention in procuring exact information, and not barely the effect, or that he actually poſſeſſed an accurate account of the whole. I agree with Maldonate, who ſays, "Non "ſcientiam his verbis, ſed diligentiam ſuam commendat, "quam in quærendis, veſtigandis, explorandiſque iis "rebus adhibuerit quas ſcribere volebat." The interpretation here given, is alſo, in my judgment, more conformable to the import of the verb παρακολουθεω in other paſſages of the N. T. where it is ſpoken of perſons. 1 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim iii. 10. That L. was not, as Whitby ſuppoſes, an attendant on our Lord's miniſtry, the contraſt, in the preceding verſe, of αυτοπται και υπηρεται, *eye-witneſſes and miniſters*, to what he calls, in this verſe, παρηκολουθηκως ασιν ακριβως, clearly ſhows. Can we imagine that, by this leſs explicit phraſe, he would have deſcribed the ſource of his own intelligence, had he been himſelf of the αυτοπται και ὑπηρεται. There is, beſides, in the preceding words, another contraſt of the αυτοπται who gave the firſt teſtimony concerning Jeſus, to thoſe who received their teſtimony, in which latter claſs he includes himſelf, παρεδοσαν ἡμιν οἱ απ' αρχης αυτοπται. Now, if it had not been his expreſs purpoſe to rank himſelf among theſe; if he had meant to oppoſe the αυτοπται to thoſe only who, from their information, had formerly undertaken narratives, the proper and obvious expreſſion would have been, καθως παρεδοσαν ΑΥΤΟΙΣ οἱ απ' αρχης αυτοπται.

3. *To write a particular account to thee*, καθεξης σοι γραψαι. E. T. *To write unto thee in order*. From the word καθεξης we cannot conclude, as ſome have haſtily done, that the order of time is obſerved better by this, than by any other, Evangeliſt. The word καθεξη does not neceſſarily relate to time. See Acts xviii. 23. The proper import of it is *diſtinctly, particularly*, as oppoſed to *confuſedly, generally*.

3. *Theophilus*, Θεοφιλε. It has been queſtioned whether this word is to be underſtood here as a proper name, or as an appellative. In the latter caſe, it ought to be rendered *lover of God*. But I prefer the former, which is the more uſual way of underſtanding it. For, 1ſt, If the Evangeliſt meant to addreſs his diſcourſe to all pious Chriſtians, and had no one individual in view, I think he would have put this intention beyond all doubt, by uſing the plural number, and ſaying κρατιστοι Θεοφιλοι. 2dly, This enigmatical manner of addreſſing all true Chriſtians, under the appearance of beſpeaking the attention of an individual, does not ſeem agreeable to the ſimplicity of ſtyle uſed in the Goſpel, and muſt have appeared to the writer himſelf as what could not fail to be miſunderſtood by moſt readers, proper names of ſuch a form as Theophilus, and even this very name, being common in Gr. and La. authors. 3dly, In the Scriptures, when φιλοθεος, that is, *lover*, or *friend*, makes part of a compound epithet, it is always, if I miſtake not, placed in the beginning, not the end, of the compound. The Apoſtle Paul, to expreſs *lover of God*, ſays, Φιλοθεος (2 Tim. iii. 4.). There occur alſo, in holy writ, ſeveral other compoſitions, after the ſame manner, of which this noun makes a part; as, φιλαγαθος, φιλαδελφος, φιλανδρος, φιλανθρωπος, φιλαργυρος, φιλαυτος, φιληδονος, φιλονεικος φιλοξενος, φιλοσοφος, φιλοτεκνος, φιλοτιμος. The other manner wherein φιλος is placed in the end, though not unexampled in claſſical writers, is much more uncommon. Laſtly, what is ſaid in the fourth verſe evidently ſhews, that the author addreſſed himſelf to a perſon, with whoſe manner of being inſtructed in the Chriſtian doctrine he was particularly acquainted.

4. *Moſt*

4. *Moſt excellent*, κρατιστε. Some conſider this as an epithet, denoting the character of the perſon named, others as an honorary title, expreſſing reſpect to office or rank. I prefer the latter opinion. The word occurs only in three other places of the N. T. all in the Acts of the Apoſtles, another work of the ſame hand. In theſe places, the title is manifeſtly given as a mark of reſpect to eminence of ſtation. Accordingly it is only on Felix and Feſtus, when they were governors of the province, that we find it conferred. It is therefore not improbable that Theophilus has been the chief magiſtrate of ſome city of note in Greece or Aſia Minor, and conſequently entitled to be addreſſed in this reſpectful manner. For though Paul obſerves (1 Cor. i. 26.), that there were not many wiſe men after the fleſh, not many rich, not many noble, in the Chriſtian community, his expreſſion plainly ſuggeſts that there were ſome. And at the ſame time that we find the inſpired penmen ready to ſhow all due reſpect to magiſtracy, and to give honour, as well as tribute, to whom it is due; no writers are leſs chargeable with giving flattering titles to men. Such compellations, therefore, as αγαθε, βασιλευ, κρατιστε, when they may be conſidered as adulatory or complimental, however uſual among the Greeks, do not ſuit the manner of the ſacred writers. When Paul gave this title to Feſtus, it appears that it was cuſtomary ſo to addreſs the Roman preſidents or procurators. In this manner we find Felix, his predeceſſor in office, was addreſſed both by the military tribune Lyſias, and by the orator Tertullus. Such titles are a mere piece of deference to the civil eſtabliſhment, and imply dignity of function or rank, but no perſonal quality in the man to whom they are given. The ſame diſtinction, between official reſpect and perſonal, attains amongſt ourſelves. Among ſo many reverends, it is, no doubt, poſſible to find ſome whoſe private character would entitle them to no reverence. And it will not, perhaps, be thought miraculous to meet with an honourable, on whom the principles of honour and honeſty have little influence. The order of civil ſociety requires a certain deference to office and rank, independently of the merit of the occupant, and a proper attention in paying this deference ſhows regard to the conſtitution of the country, and is of public utility in more reſpects than one. But of thoſe commendatory epithets, which are merely perſonal, theſe writers, alike untainted with fanaticiſm and flattery, are very ſparing. They well knew, that where they are moſt merited, they are leaſt coveted, or even needed. But, in a few ages afterwards, the face of things, in this reſpect, changed greatly. In proportion as men became more deficient in valuable qualities, they became more fond and more laviſh of fine words.

5. *Of the courſe of Abijah*, εξ εφημεριδος Αβια. This was one of the twenty four ſacerdotal families into which the whole order was divided by David (1 Chron. xxiv. 3, &c.), and which ſerved in the temple by turns.

9. *The ſanctuary* του ναου. E. T. *The temple.* Had the word been το ιερον, it could not have been rendered otherwiſe than *the temple*; but ο ναος, though commonly tranſlated the ſame way, is not ſynonymous. The former comprehended the whole edifice, with all its enclosures, piazzas, and other buildings; the latter included only what was termed, by way of eminence, the houſe, conſiſting of the veſtibule, the holy place or ſanctuary, and the moſt holy. The altar of incenſe, on which the perfumes were burnt, was in the ſanctuary: the people who were praying without, were in the temple, εν τω ιερω, in the court of Iſrael, though not in what was ſtrictly called the houſe of God, that is εν τω ναω. In order to render the verſion as explicit as the original, it behoves us to avoid confounding things in the one, which are not confounded in the other.

15. *Any fermented liquor*, σικερα E. T. *Strong drink.* Some think that by this name was meant a liquor made of dates, the fruit of the palm tree, a drink much uſed in the Eaſt. But I ſee no reaſon for confining the term to this ſignification. The word is Heb. שכר *ſhecher*, and has been retained by the Seventy interpreters in thoſe paſſages where the law of the Nazarites is laid down, and in the rules to be obſerved by the prieſts, when it ſhould be their turn to officiate in the temple. The Heb. root ſignifies *to inebriate*, or *make drunk*. All fermented liquors, therefore, as being capable of producing this effect, were underſtood as implied in the term. *Strong drink* is not the meaning.

17. *And by the wiſdom of the righteous, to render the diſobedient a people well diſpoſed for the Lord*, και απειθεις εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι Κυριω λαον κατεσκευασμενον. E. T. *And the diſobedient to the wiſdom of the juſt, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.* The conſtruction in this way of rendering the words, muſt be και επιστρεψαι απειθεις εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι λαον κατεσκευασμενον Κυριω. I readily admit that εν in the N. T. is ſometimes uſed, according to the Heb. idiom for εις or επι, and ſometimes for συν or for δια; but this conceſſion is not to be underſtood as implying, that ſuch a uſe may happen equally in whatever way the words be connected. I queſtion whether the verb επιστρεφω will ever be found joined with the prepoſition εν, for expreſſing to turn to, or to convert to. It renders it the more improbable that this ſhould be the caſe here, as in the preceding clauſe we find the verb επιστρεψαι followed by the prepoſition επι, for expreſſing this very idea, *turning to*, or *converting to*. That in two parallel and ſimilar clauſes, depending on the ſame verb, ſuch an alteration ſhould be made in the conſtruction, is very improbable, being repugnant at once to ſimplicity, perſpicuity, and propriety. It has ſome weight alſo, that as, in that explanation, the ſentence has three clauſes, though the firſt and the ſecond are coupled by the conjunction και, there is no copulative prefixed to the third. This, at leaſt, is unuſual,

and

and ſuits neither the Heb. idiom nor the Gr. In the way I underſtand the ſentence, it has but two clauſes. Απειθεις is not governed by επιστρεψαι, but by the following verb ετοιμασαι. The placing of a comma after απειθεις is all the change neceſſary in the pointing. This makes εν φρονησει δικαιων fall between two commas, and expreſs the manner in which the Baptiſt was to effect thoſe changes, namely, by inculcating that diſpoſition of mind which, with righteous men, is the only genuine wiſdom or prudence. Biſhop Pearce has given the ſame turn to the ſentence; only he ſeems to think that the word δικαιων peculiarly relates to John himſelf. This ſuppoſition is quite unneceſſary, and, as the word is in the plural number, embarraſſes the conſtruction. The wiſdom of the righteous may well be underſtood as oppoſed to the wiſdom of the ungodly, in like manner as the wiſdom which is from above (another phraſe for the ſame thing) is oppoſed to the wiſdom which is from beneath.

23. *His days of officiating*; that is, his week (for it laſted no longer at one turn); during which time he was not permitted to leave the precincts of the temple, or to have any intercourſe with his wife.

28. *Favourite of Heaven*, κεχαριτωμενη. Vul. *Gratiâ plena.* There is no doubt that, in the ſenſe wherein this laſt expreſſion was uſed by Jerom, it was of the ſame import with that given here, after Dod. and with that uſed in the E. T. *thou that art highly favoured.* But at preſent, the phraſe *full of grace* would not convey the ſame meaning. Be. *Gratis dilecta.* This, though in ſtrictneſs (if we conſider only the import of the words taken ſeverally) it may be defended, conveys an inſinuation exceedingly improper and unjuſt. *Gratis dilecta* is preciſely ſuch a compellation as we ſhould reckon ſuitable, had it been given to the woman whom our Lord permitted to anoint his feet in the houſe of Simon, to the great ſcandal of that phariſee, who knew her former life. What might even but obliquely ſuggeſt a conception ſo remote from the ſcope of the Evangeliſt, ought carefully to be avoided.

28. *The Lord be with thee*, ο κυριος μετα σου. E. *The Lord is with thee.* Vul. Er. and Zu. *Dominus tecum.* Be. *Dominus tecum eſt.* As the ſubſtantive verb is not expreſſed in the original, it may be interpreted either in the indicative or in the optative. When rendered as an affirmation, we cannot queſtion its truth. But it ſeems more ſuitable to the form of ſalutation, which is always expreſſive of good wiſhes, to underſtand it in the latter of theſe ways. The word χαιρε, which immediately precedes, ſuits this interpretation, and ſo did all the forms of ſaluting cuſtomary among the Hebrews, ſuch as, *Peace be to this houſe; the Lord be with you*; and *the Lord bleſs you.* See ch. x. 5. Ruth. ii. 4.

28. *Thou happieſt of women*, ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν. E. T. *Bleſſed art thou among women.* I conceive this expreſſion here as more properly a compellation than either an affirmation or a ſalutation; and I underſtand the pronoun as emphatical, and in the vocative. Such a phraſe as ευλογημενη εν γυναιξιν is, in the Heb. idiom, an expreſſion of the ſuperlative. It is accordingly ſo rendered by Caſ. in this place, *mulierum fortunatiſſima.* The ſame idiom is ſometimes ſimilarly uſed in the E. T. Thus, η καλη εν γυναιξιν in the Sep. which is literally from the Heb. is, with us, *thou faireſt among women*, Cant. i. 8. and לישׁ כבחמה גבור *laiſh gibbor kabchemah, a lion, which is ſtrongeſt among beaſts*, Prov. xxx. 30. The expreſſion uſed here by the Evangeliſt we find repeated, v. 42.; but as it is coupled with another clauſe, και ευλογημενος ο καρπος της κοιλιας σου, it muſt there be underſtood as an affirmation.

29. *At his appearance and words ſhe was perplexed*, η δε ιδουσα, διεταραχθη επι τω λογω αυτου. Vul. *Quæ cum audiſſet, turbata eſt in ſermone ejus.* This verſion would appear to have ſprung from a different reading; yet there is no known reading that is entirely conformable to it. The Cam. and two other MSS. omit ιδουσα. Si. thinks that the Vul. fully expreſſes the meaning of the original, and that the Evangeliſt, in ſaying ιδουσα, has, by a trope not unuſual with the ſacred authors, expreſſed the operation of one of our ſenſes by a term which, in ſtrictneſs, belongs to another. I admit, that there are examples of this kind, but I ſee no occaſion for recurring to them here. It cannot be queſtioned that ſuch an extraordinary appearance, as well as the words ſpoken, would contribute to affect the mind of the Virgin with apprehenſion and fear.

35. *The holy progeny*, το γενωμενον αγιον. E. T. *That holy thing which ſhall be born of thee.* Vul. *Quod naſcetur ex te ſanctum.* This is one of the few inſtances in which our tranſlators have deſerted the common Gr. and preferred the preſent reading of the Vul. There are indeed four MSS. only one of them of note, and the firſt Sy. with ſome other verſions, which concur with the Vul. in reading εκ σου after το γενωμενον. But though this is the reading of the authoriſed editions of the Vul. it is not the reading of moſt of the MS. copies. Some of the Fathers read theſe words in ſome MSS. and attempted to account for the omiſſion of them, in the much greater number, by imputing it to the Eutychians and other heretics, who (they would have us believe) expunged them, becauſe unfavourable to their errors. But it is far more probable that the orthodox, or ruling party, who were as chargeable with frauds of this ſort as any heretics, ſhould have had it in their power to foiſt the words in queſtion into four or five copies, which are all as yet found to have them, than that any ſectaries ſhould have had it in their power to expunge them out of more than fifty times that number, in which they are wanting. As the ſenſe is complete without them, the greater number of copies, eſpecially where the difference in number is ſo conſiderable, ought to determine the point. Wet. ſuſpects, and not implauſibly, that the inſerted words have been tranſferred hither from Gal. iv. 4. As there is nothing in the words themſelves that is not briſkly conformable to truth, it is eaſy to aſſign a reaſon why ſome modern editors, and even

translators, have thought it more eligible to insert than to omit them. In such cases, this will be found the most common way of deciding.

37. *Nothing is impossible with God,* ουκ αδυνατησει παρα του Θεου παν ῥημα. Vul. *Non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum.* Diss. IX. P. II. § 9.

45. *Happy is she who believed,* μακαρια η πιστευσασα. Vul. *Beata quæ credidisti.* In like manner Cas. *Beatam te quæ credideris.* A little after, in the same verse, both have *tibi*, where in the original it is αυτη. This expression of the sentiment, by the second person instead of the third, seems peculiar to these translators, but does not affect the sense.

45. *That those things which the Lord hath promised her shall be performed,* οτι εσται τελειωσις τοις λελαλημενοις αυτη παρα Κυριου, E. T. *For there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.* Vul. *Quoniam perficientur ea quæ dicta sunt tibi a Domino.* To the same purpose Be. *Nam consummabuntur ea quæ dicta sunt ei a Domino.* Cas. differently, *Perfectum ire quæ tibi a Domino significata sunt.* The instances in the N. T. wherein οτι does not signify *because*, but *that*, are very many. The. understands it so in this place. So also does Gro. and some other expositors of name. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation. The reasons which have induced me to prefer the latter are the following. After πιστευω, when a clause is subjoined representing the thing believed, it is invariably introduced by οτι, which in those cases cannot be rendered otherwise than *that*. See Mt. ix. 28. Mr. xi. 23, 24. J. xi. 27. 42. xiii. 19. xiv. 10, 11. xvi. 27. 30. xvii. 8. 21. xx. 31. I have, for the sake of brevity, referred only to examples which occur in the Gospels. 2dly, The person or subject believed is always subjoined, unless there be something in the preceding words which show clearly what it is. Now there is nothing here in the preceding words which can suggest what was believed. It is then highly probable, that it is contained in the words succeeding. 3dly, That this clause expresses, not the reward of belief, but the thing believed, is probable from this consideration, that Elizabeth had doubtless in view the superiority of Mary, above her own husband Zacharias, inasmuch as the former readily believed the heavenly messenger which the latter did not. Now, if Elizabeth meant to point out the superior felicity of Mary, on account of her faith, she would never have specified a circumstance which happened equally to her who believed, and to him who did not believe; for to both there was a performance of those things which had been told them from the Lord. It would have been rather inopportune to mention this circumstance as the special reward of her faith, though very appositte to subjoin it as the subject.

Some have thought that the words παρα Κυριου, in the end, are better connected with τελειωσις, and that, therefore, τοις λελαλημενοις αυτη should be included between commas. When the effect is equal in respect of the sense, the simplest manner of construing the sentence ought to be preferred. Admitting then, that παρα Κυριου may be properly conjoined either with τελειωσις, or with λελαλημενοις αυτη, it is preferable to adopt the construction which suits the order of the words, where there is no special reason for deferring that order. The phrase, *things spoken* or *promised to her*, does not necessarily imply that it was the Lord who spoke them, even though he be mentioned as the author of the events; but, in speaking of the performance of things promised by the Lord, it is manifestly implied, that the Lord hath performed them. A promise is performed only by the promiser. This is, therefore, better, as it is a fuller expression of what is admitted on all sides to be the meaning. One would almost think of some critics, that they dislike an exposition, because it is obvious, and prefer one palpably worse, which requires some transposition of the words. To transpose the words is sometimes necessary in explaining these writings, but the presumption is always against the transposition, when the words, as they lie, yield as good and as pertinent a meaning.

49. *Whose name is venerable,* και αγιον το ονομα αυτου. Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c.

51. *Dispelleth the vain imaginations of the proud,* διεσκορπισεν υπερηφανους καρδιας αυτων. E. T. *He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.* Gro. justly observes, that this is a figurative manner of expressing, *He scattereth the proud, as to what concerns the thoughts of their hearts;* that is, *their vain imaginations.* "Dissipavit superbos quod consilia cordis ipsorum at-"tinet." Maldonate says, to the same purpose, "Dis-"persit superbos mente cordis sui, *pro* dispersit cogita-"tiones cordis superborum, id est, ipsorum consilia et "machinationes." With the Hellenist Jews it is not unusual in such canticles to express general truths or observations, which have no relation to any particular time, by the aorist. See the song of Hanna, 1 Sam. ii. 1, &c. in the Sep. version, which bears a resemblance to this of Mary. I have in this version employed the present, as better suited to the genius of our language.

54, 55. *He supporteth Israel his servant (as he promised to our fathers), ever inclined to mercy towards Abraham and his race,* αντιλαβετο Ισραηλ παιδος αυτου, μνησθηναι ελεους (καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων) τω Αβρααμ και τω σπερματι αυτου εις τον αιωνα. E. T. *He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.* There can hardly be a reasonable doubt that there is, in this passage, an infringement of the natural order. Such a construction as ελαλησε προς τους πατερας, τω Αβρααμ, is, to the best of my remembrance, unexampled in these writings. All the correction in the pointing necessary in Gr. for avoiding this singular construction, is very simple. If we include καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων, in a parenthesis, the apparent solecism is totally removed. But the irregular syntax

in

in the ſentence, as commonly read, which has often been remarked by the critics, is not the only objection to it. The expreſſion is not agreeable to the ſtyle of Scripture on theſe ſubjects. In relation to the promiſes, God is very often ſaid, in general, to have ſpoken to the fathers, or, in particular, to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; but never to Abraham and his poſterity. That thoſe promiſes concern the poſterity is plain, and is often mentioned; but it is nowhere ſaid that they were ſpoken to them. The very addition of the words *for ever*, εις τον αιωνα, ſhows the ſame thing, to wit, that their connection is not with ελαλησε, but with μνησθηναι ελεος. Some editors, ſenſible of this, though not ſenſible of the irregularity of the conſtruction, as the paſſage is commonly interpreted, or of the impropriety of the expreſſion now taken notice of, have included all between ελεος and εις τον αιωνα in a parentheſis. Theſe, by their manner of departing from the order of the words in the explanation they give of them, make a ſtill greater ſtretch, and a longer ſuſpenſion of the ſenſe, to leſs purpoſe.

2. *To remember mercy* is not an unfrequented Oriental idiom, for expreſſing to incline to mercy, to be merciful. See Pſ. xcviii. 2.

64. *And his mouth was opened directly, and his tongue looſed*, ανεωχθη δε το ſτομα αυτου παραχρημα και η γλωσσα αυτου. In adding the word *looſed*, I have followed the common tranſlation. The genius of modern tongues does not always permit the freedoms uſed by the ancients. But it ſometimes happens that, in attempting to eſcape one difficulty, a perſon runs, before he is aware, into a greater. Elſner was ſo ſtruck with the incongruity (as it appeared to him) of the application of ανεωχθη to γλωσσα, that, in order to avoid it, he has attempted to conſtrue the ſentence in a quite different manner, making one clauſe to end with the word παραχρημα, and making the noun γλωσσα the nominative to the following verb ελαλει. The ſubſequent member of the ſentence, according to him, ſtands thus, και η γλωσσα αυτου και ελαλει ευλογων τον Θεον. Paſſing the objections to which the form of the expreſſion is liable (for the examples he produces in ſupport of his hypotheſis are far from being ſimilar), it is ſtrange that a man of his knowledge and diſcernment did not diſcover that γλωσσα ευλογων was incomparably more exceptionable than the expreſſion againſt which he objected. Raphelius and others have given the moſt convincing evidence, that ſuch idioms as a verb joined to two nouns, related in meaning to each other, to one of which alone the verb is ſtrictly applicable, are warranted by the moſt approved claſſical authority in proſe and verſe. The σιτον και οινον εδοντες of Homer is well known. Nor does that of the apoſtle greatly differ. Γαλα υμας εποτισα και ου βρωμα, which is literally in Eng. *I made you drink milk and not meat*, 1 Cor. iii. 2. This ſounds rather more harſhly to us than the literal verſion of the text under examination. *Then were opened his mouth and his tongue.* But we ſee that even critics, ſometimes, rather than acknowledge in the ſacred penmen a negligence of expreſſion, not without example in the beſt writers, will find it neceſſary to admit a blunder hardly to be met with in the worſt.

67. *Propheſied*, προεφητευσε. I have retained the word; though, in the Jewiſh idiom, *to propheſy* admits of ſeveral ſenſes. Amongſt others, it often means to expreſs the devout ſentiments to which a particular occurrence gives riſe, in ſuch a ſong of praiſe as that which he has ſubjoined. It muſt be owned, however, that, in this canticle, there are ſome things which, in ſtrict propriety, are prophetical, according to the acceptation of the term *prophecy*, in our language. This is an additional reaſon for retaining the word in this place.

69, 70, 71. *And (as anciently he promiſed by his holy Prophets) hath raiſed a Prince for our deliverance, in the houſe of David his ſervant; for our deliverance from our enemies, and from the hands of all who hate us*—και ηγειρε κερας σωτηριας ημιν εν τω οικω Δαβιδ του παιδος αυτου καθως ελαλησε δια ſοματος των αγιων των απ' αιωνος προφητων αυτου, σωτηριαν εξ εχθρων ημων, και εκ χειρος παντων των μισουντων ημας. E. T. *And hath raiſed up an horn of ſalvation for us in the houſe of his ſervant David; as he ſpake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been ſince the world began: that we ſhould be ſaved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us.* All ſuch Scripture ſongs, as that from which theſe words are taken, are expreſſed in the Oriental poetic idiom, reſembling that of the Pſalms. Now, it is impoſſible to render theſe into another language, with tolerable clearneſs and propriety, without uſing greater latitude of expreſſion than is neceſſary in tranſlating plain proſe. For this reaſon, I have taken the freedom to make, here, a ſmall alteration in the arrangement. The 70th verſe is a parentheſis; and, that the interruption which it gives to the meaning may, as little as poſſible, hurt perſpicuity, I have introduced it immediately after *and*, in the beginning of v. 69. In conſequence of this tranſpoſition, the verb ηγειρε is more cloſely connected with its regimen, σωτηριαν. I have alſo preferred the proper term, to the trope, in the tranſlation of κερας. *Horn of ſalvation*, is both too obſcure, and too little ſuited to our mode of ſpeaking, to be fit for admiſſion into modern languages. When there can be no doubt about the meaning, a tranſlator ought not anxiouſly to trace figures which do not ſuit the language he is writing. Often a metaphor, which has energy, and even elegance, in one tongue, is both dark and uncouth in another. For the greater clearneſs, I have alſo rendered ελαλησε, *promiſed*, a ſenſe which it often has in the prophetic writings.

75. *In piety and ſtrict juſtice*, εν οσιοτητι και δικαιοσυνη ενωπιον αυτου. The two laſt words, ενωπιον αυτου, *before him*, that is, God, are a common Hebraiſm, to denote that the virtues mentioned are genuine, exact, ſtrict, as under the eye of God.

78. *Who*

78. *Who hath caused a light to spring from on high to visit us, or ὃις ἐπισκέψατο ἡμας ἀνατολη ἐξ ὑψους.* E. T. *Whereby the day spring from on high hath visited us. The day-spring* is an expression rather indefinite. If it mean *the dawn*, it is too faint an image for the subject. It has been observed, by critics, that ἀνατολη is the word used by the Sep. in rendering the Heb. צמח *tsemoch*, which signifies *a branch*, or a young shoot, a name by which the Messiah appears to have been denominated by some of the Prophets. The word ἀνατολη is also used sometimes to denote *the sun-rising*; lastly, it signifies the East, or the quarter of the heavens in which he rises. That it does not, in this place, answer to *branch*, the reason urged by Gro. Ham. and other commentators, is sufficient evidence. It is not natural to speak of sending a branch, to enlighten those who are in darkness, or to direct their feet in the way. If the sun, as he appears in rising, had been here alluded to, ἀνατολη would not have been without the article. Besides, it is so far justly argued, by Wet. that the rising sun cannot be here understood by ἀνατολη, because the sun, when he rises, is always in the horizon; whereas this light is spoken of as coming from on high, ἐξ ὑψους, and must, therefore, be rather vertical than horizontal. Now, the word ἀνατολη imports not only *oriens*, but *ortus*; and is alike applicable to any light newly sprung up, or appearing. This sense of the word I have adopted here, and endeavoured to express with perspicuity.

CHAP. II.

1. *All the inhabitants of the empire, πασαν την οικουμενην.* E. T. *All the world.* Vul. *Universus orbis.* Οικουμενη means, strictly, the inhabited part of the earth, and therefore, πασα ἡ οικουμενη, *all the world*, in the common acceptation of the phrase. But it is well known, that this expression was, in ancient times, frequently employed to denote *Roman empire*. It has, probably, been a title first assumed by the Romans, through arrogance, afterwards given by others through flattery, and at last appropriated, by general use, to this signification. That it has a more extensive meaning, in this place, is not, I think, pretended by any. But there are some who, on the contrary, would confine it still further, making it denote no more than Judea and its appendages. Of this opinion are several of the learned, Beau. Dod. Lardner, Pearce, and others. In support of it, they have produced some passages, in which this phrase, or expressions equivalent, appear to have no larger signification. Admitting their explanation of the passages they produce, they are not parallel to the example in hand. Such hyperbolés are indeed current, not only in the language of the Evangelists, but in every language. In those cases, however, wherein they are introduced, there rarely fails to be something, either in what is spoken, or in the occasion of speaking, which serves to explain the trope. For example: the term, *a country*, in English, denotes, properly, a region or tract of land inhabited by a people living under the same government, and having the same laws. By this, which is the common acceptation, we should say that England is *a country*. Yet the term is often used, without any ambiguity, in a more limited sense. Thus, to adopt a familiar illustration: An inhabitant of a country-town, or parish, says to one of his neighbours, speaking of a young man and a young woman of their acquaintance, "All the country says "that they are soon to be married;" yet so far is he from meaning, by the phrase, *all the country*, all the people of England, that he is sensible that not a thousandth part of them knows that such persons exist. He means no more than *all the village*, or *all the neighbourhood*. Nor is he in the smallest danger, in speaking thus, of being misunderstood by any hearer. Every body perceives that, in such cases, the phrase has a greater or less extent of meaning, according to the sphere of the persons spoken of. But if, on the other hand, he should say, "The "parliament has laid a tax on saddle-horses through-"out all the country;" nobody could imagine that less than England were intended by the term *country*, in this application. Here the term must be considered as it stands related to parliament; in other words, it must be that which, in the style of the legislature, would be named *the country*. In like manner, though it might not be extraordinary that a Jew, addressing himself to Jews, and speaking of their own people only, should employ such an hyperbolé as *all the world*, for all Judea, it would be exceedingly unnatural in him, and, therefore, highly improbable that he should use the same terms, applied in the same manner, in relating the resolves and decrees of the Roman emperor, to whom all Judea would be very far from appearing all the world, or even a considerable part of it. In reporting the orders given by another, especially a sovereign, the reporter is presumed to convey the ideas, and even, as nearly as possible, the words, of the person or sovereign of whom he speaks. Some have, not improbably, supposed, for it is in the manner of exact narrators, that the words, απογραφεσθαι παν οικουμενην, were the words of the emperor's edict, and copied thence by the Evangelist. I shall only add, that the Sy. interpreter, as all the other ancient interpreters, understood the words in the same manner, כלה עמא דאוהרנה *all the people of his* (the emperor's) *dominions*. I am not insensible, that this opinion is liable to objections, from the silence of the historians, and the improbability of the thing: and though these objections do not appear to me so formidable, as they do to some others, the examination of them, severally, would lead into a length of discussion but ill suited to my design. I shall, therefore, only add, in general, that, for my own part, I should have less scruple in admitting that, about a point of this kind, the extent of the emperor's edict (which nowise affects the faith of a Christian), the writer might have mistaken, or been misinformed, than in giving such forced meanings, and unnatural construction, to his words, as tend but

too manifeſtly to unſettle all language, and render every thing in words ambiguous and doubtful. May not that be here called *an edict*, which was no more than *a declared purpoſe*, a purpoſe, too, not to be executed at once, but gradually, as circumſtances would permit?

2. *Should be regiſtered*, απογραφεσθαι. E. T. *Should be taxed*. Vul. and Be. *Deſcriberetur*. Er. Zu. and Caſ. *Cenſeretur*. Our tranſlators have, in this inſtance, not ſo properly, in my opinion, preferred the three laſt. Απογραφεσθαι is, ſtrictly, *to be regiſtered*, or *inrolled*; αποτιμασθαι, *to be taxed*. Almoſt all the modern tranſlations, I have ſeen, into Itn. Fr. or Eng. have adopted the former interpretation. As *the regiſter* was commonly made with a view to *taxing*; it may, no doubt, in many caſes, be, with ſufficient propriety, rendered in the manner our tranſlators, and others, have done. However, as in this place there is ſome difficulty, it is better to adhere ſtrictly to the import of the words. Though it was commonly for the purpoſe of taxing that a regiſter was made, it was not always, or neceſſarily ſo. In the preſent caſe, we have ground to believe, that there was no immediate view to taxation, at leaſt with reſpect to Judea. Herod (called the Great) was then alive, and king of the country, and though in ſubordination to the Romans, of whom he may juſtly be ſaid to have held his crown; yet, as they allowed him all the honours of royalty, there is no ground to think that, either in his lifetime, or before the baniſhment of his ſon Archelaus, the Romans would directly, by their own officers, levy any toll or tribute from the people of Judea. Nay, we have the teſtimony of the Jewiſh hiſtorian, Joſephus, that they did not, till after the expulſion of Archelaus, when the country was annexed to Syria, and ſo become part of a Roman province. But it may appear an objection to this account, that it ſhould be conſidered in an imperial edict as a part, in any reſpect, of the Roman empire; and that one ſhould be ſent, by the emperor, into the country, to make an inrolment of the people. To this I anſwer, that as to the name οικουμενη, though it has been ſhown, that it was commonly employed to denote the Roman empire, we ought not to interpret the name *empire* too rigidly, as confined to the provinces under the immediate dominion of Rome. It may well be underſtood to comprehend all the countries tributary to, or dependent on, Rome. Now, there is one important purpoſe that ſuch regiſters, even where no tax was impoſed, were well fitted to anſwer; they enabled thoſe haughty lords of the world to know the ſtate of their dependencies, and to form a judgment, both as to the ſums of money which might be reaſonably exacted from their reſpective princes, and as to the number of ſoldiers which might be obtained in caſe of war. Nor is it at all improbable, that when a cenſus was making of the empire, properly ſo called, the inrolment of the families might be extended to Judea, with a view to the exaction of an oath of fidelity, as Wet. ſuppoſes, founding his opinion on a paſſage of Joſephus, and with no deſign of taxing the country then. Yet the regiſter, taken at that time, might be afterwards uſed by the Romans, for aſſiſting them in levying a tax.

2. *This firſt regiſter took effect, when Cyrenius was preſident of Syria*, αυτη η απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο, ηγεμονευοντος της Συριας Κυρηνιου. E. T. *And this taxing was firſt made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria*. Vul. *Hæc deſcriptio prima facta eſt a præſide Syriæ Cyrino*. About the import of this verſe, there is a great diverſity of opinions among the critics. Yet, when we attend to it, as it lies, without taking into conſideration the knowledge we derive from another quarter, we ſhould hardly think there were a verſe in the Goſpel about which there is leſs ſcope for doubt. That which has principally given riſe to the queſtions that have been agitated on this ſubject, is a paſſage in Joſephus (Ant. b. 18. c. 1.), from which it appears, that the tax levied by Cyrenius, which was the firſt impoſed upon the people by the Romans, happened about ten or eleven years after the time here ſpoken of by L.; for, according to Joſephus, it was after the expulſion of Archelaus, when Judea was reduced to the condition of a Roman province. As, at the time when that hiſtorian wrote, the event was both recent and memorable, it having given birth to an inſurrection under Judas of Galilee, which, though ſoon quelled to appearance, became the latent ſource of a war, that ended in the ruin of the nation; it is impoſſible to think that that hiſtorian could either have erred through ignorance, or have attempted wilfully to miſrepreſent what muſt have been known to thouſands then living. We cannot, therefore, with Maldonate, and others, cut ſhort the matter at once, by ſacrificing the credit of the hiſtorian to the authority of the Evangeliſt; becauſe this will be found, in the iſſue, to do a material injury to the Evangeliſt himſelf. Let us try, then, whether, without doing violence to the words of Scripture, which, in caſes of this kind, is too often done, we can explain them, ſo as not to be inconſiſtent with the account given by the hiſtorian. And, firſt, as to the attempts which have been made by others, with the ſame view; it is hardly neceſſary to mention, that ſome are for extirpating this verſe altogether, as an interpolation. This is an expeditious method of getting rid of a difficulty, which I am ſorry to ſee ſome learned men, in this age, ſo ready to adopt; though, it muſt be owned, this expedient tends very much to ſhorten the critic's labour. But it is a ſufficient anſwer to this, that it is a mere hypotheſis, and, I will add, a moſt licentious hypotheſis, inaſmuch as it is not pretended, that there is a ſingle MS. or edition, ancient tranſlation, or commentary, in which the verſe is wanting. When the thing, therefore, is properly viewed, we have here a cloud of witneſſes, numerous and venerable, the ſame by whom the Goſpel itſelf is atteſted to us, in oppoſition to a mere poſſibility. Of the ſame kind is the ſubſtitu-

tion of Saturninus or Quintilius for Cyrenius. Others, more moderate, attempt to remove the difficulty by a different interpretation of the paſſage, rendering it, after The. *This regiſter was made before Cyrenius was governor of Syria;* and, for this ſenſe and application of the ſuperlative πρωτος, for the comparative προτερος, examples are quoted from the Goſpel of J. Thus, πρωτος μου ην, *He was before me*, J. i. 15. 30. and εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν, *It hated me before it hated you*, xv. 18. For ſome time paſt, this ſolution of the difficulty appears to have been the moſt favourable by interpreters, both abroad and at home. Now, there are ſeveral conſiderations which oppoſe the admiſſion of ſuch an idiom in the preſent caſe. Firſt, among the ſacred writers, it ſeems to be peculiar to the Evangeliſt J. Nothing ſimilar is found in this Goſpel or the Acts, both written by L. nor in any other writer of the N. T. I ſee no reaſon to conſider it as an Helleniſtic idiom, being without example in the Sep. Nor can it be called Oriental, as the Orientals have neither comparatives nor ſuperlatives, but expreſs the meaning of both by periphraſis. Secondly, The expreſſions are not ſimilar. In ſuch anomalous phraſes, the diſcovery of the ſenſe depends on the ſtricteſt obſervance of the arrangement. Πρωτος, in the inſtances quoted, is immediately prefixed, like a prepoſition, to the word it governs: thus, πρωτος μου, πρωτον υμων, —whereas, here, it is ſeparated from the word governed, Κυρηνιου, both by the verb εγενετο, and by other terms intervening. Thirdly, If the Evangeliſt meant to tell us that this regiſter was prior to another taken by Cyrenius, he ought to have ſaid, πρωτη της [απογραφης] Κυρηνιου. And if he meant to tell us that it was before Cyrenius was governor, he ought to have ſaid, either πρωτη τη ηγεμονευοντι Κυρηνιῳ, or πρωτη της ηγεμονιας Κυρηνιου. In no caſe, therefore, can the examples quoted from J. ſerve to authorize a conſtruction every way ſo irregular as this of L. is, on their hypotheſis. I will add, fourthly that, in regard to the quotations from J. though the expreſſion is not ſtrictly grammatical, it has that ſimplicity and plainneſs which warrant us to affirm, that it readily ſuggeſts the meaning to every attentive reader. With reſpect to this paſſage of L. we may juſtly affirm the reverſe, that no perſon ever did or could imagine the interpretation deviſed, who had not previouſly heard of an inconſiſtency which the obvious interpretation bore to the report of the Jewiſh hiſtorian, and who was not in queſt of ſomething, in the way of explanation, which might reconcile them. The hypotheſis of the learned and indefatigable Dr. Lardner, to whoſe labours the Chriſtian world is ſo highly indebted, is not without its difficulties. But of this preſently.

2. Ηγεμονευοντος—Κυρηνιου. There are two queſtions to which this participle gives riſe; one concerning the import of the word ηγεμων; the other concerning the intention of the participial form ηγεμονευοντος here employed. As to the firſt, it is evident that ηγεμων, in the language of the N. T. is not peculiarly appropriated to the preſident of a province, but is uſed with a good deal of latitude, being given alſo to the imperial procurators, ſuch as Pontius Pilate, and even to the prefects, who had the principal charge of any buſineſs. It is in this ſenſe, perhaps, that it is here applied to Cyrenius (or, as Tacitus calls him, Quirinius), who certainly was not, in Herod's lifetime, preſident or governor of Syria. But, on this point, I do not find any difference amongſt interpreters. As to the ſecond, it is made a queſtion, whether ηγεμονευοντος ought to be underſtood as the genitive abſolute of the participle, and, conſequently, as intended to expreſs the time when the event mentioned took place; or as equivalent to the appellative ηγεμων, and ſerving merely as a title derived from an office, which Cyrenius, ſome time or other, either before or after, poſſeſſed, and being in the genitive, as agreeing with Κυρηνιου, which is governed by απογραφη. Thoſe who conſtrue the ſentence in this manner, render it thus: *This was the firſt aſſeſſment of Cyrenius governor of Syria.* It is this mode of interpretation, which has been adopted by Lardner, as to which I beg leave to offer to the reader's conſideration the following reflections. It cannot be doubted that the participle preſent often ſupplies the place of an appellative; but, in ſuch caſes, if I remember right, it is the uniform practice to diſtinguiſh it by the article. Thus it is: ὁ βαπτιζων, ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αναγινωσκων, οἱ οικοδομουντες, οἱ κυριευοντες. On the contrary, when the participle is uſed as a participle, and, particularly, when it is in the genitive abſolute, it has not the article. Should it be argued, that it muſt, nevertheleſs, be a noun in this place, becauſe it governs the genitive, and not the caſe, of the verb; I anſwer, that the ſame circumſtance (not unuſual in Gr.) takes place in all the examples ſhortly to be produced, as to which there never was any doubt that the words were to be underſtood merely as participles in the genitive abſolute. Secondly, No way can be more proper for attaining the ſenſe of an author, in places where it may be doubtful, than by comparing thoſe with ſimilar expreſſions in other places of that author, about which all interpreters are agreed. Now, there cannot be a greater ſimilarity in conſtruction, than that which the beginning of the following chapter bears to the verſe under examination: Ηγεμονευοντος Ποντιου Πιλατου της Ιουδαιας, και τετραρχουντος της Γαλιλαιας Ηρωδου, Φιλιππου δε του αδελφου αυτου τετραρχουντος της Ιτουραιας και Τραχωνιτιδος χωρας, και Λυσανιου της Αβιληνης τετραρχουντος—εγενετο ρημα Θεου επι Ιωαννην. There cannot be a greater coincidence in ſyntax, than there is in the two paſſages now compared, inſomuch that, if there be no ambiguity in the original of the paſſage quoted (and I never heard it ſaid that there is), neither is there (notwithſtanding the learned doctor's remark) any ambiguity in the original of the paſſage under examination. The ſimilarity, in both, is ſtriking, upon the ſlighteſt attention. The preſent participles in the genitive, without the article, the firſt of theſe participles, ηγεμονευοντος, the ſame in both, and all of theſe governing the genitive, and not the accuſative, the occaſion of introducing theſe circumſtances alſo ſimilar. Now, it was

of

never queſtioned that the participles in the beginning of the third chapter, are merely participles in the genitive abſolute, employed ſolely for aſcertaining the time when John's miniſtry commenced. I ſhall bring another example from the ſame author, which is alſo ſimilar in every circumſtance (Acts xviii. 12.): Γαλλιωνος δε ανθυπατευοντος της Αχαιας, κατεπεστησαν οι Ιουδαιοι τω Παυλω.—— *When Gallio was proconſul of Achaia, the Jews made inſurrection againſt Paul* This is no Helleniſtic idiom of the Evangeliſt, it is perfectly claſſical; ανθυπατευοντος being often uſed, by the Gr. writers of Roman affairs, as correſponding to *conſulibus* in La. for marking, by the names of the conſuls in office, the date of an event or tranſaction mentioned. The remark, therefore, that names of office, and participles, ſupplying the place of ſuch names, do not always imply that the office was poſſeſſed at the very time to which the action or event refers, though certainly true, is not applicable to the caſe in hand. The words, expreſſed in the preciſe manner above explained, can be neither names of office, nor introduced for ſupplying the place of ſuch names, but participles of the preſent, ſpecially intended for fixing the circumſtance of time. I cannot, therefore, admit this hypotheſis of Lardner (though at firſt inclinable to it), without infringing the common rules of ſyntax, and doing injury to the manner of the ſacred writer, I may rather ſay, to his meaning, manifeſtly ſhown, from inſtances in other places entirely ſimilar. Further, had it been the Evangeliſt's intention to ſignify that the regiſter was made by Cyrenius, the proper expreſſion would have been υπο Κυρηνιου; for, in that caſe, it would have clearly been (what it muſt have been the writer's intention to repreſent it) the regiſter only of the empire της οικουμενης, executed by Cyrenius. One would think that the author of the Vul. had found the prepoſition in the Gr. MS. he uſed, as we read, in his tranſlation, *a præſide Syriæ Cyrino*. But ſome critics of the La. church, particularly Maldonate, reject the prepoſition as interpolated. Si. evidently ſuſpects it, and obſerves that, in the margin of ſome MS. La. Bibles, it is corrected in the notes called *correctoria*. Now, as this reading has no countenance from Gr. MSS. ancient commentaries, or printed editions, it is entitled to no regard. And, if it were, the only difference it would make on the ſentence is this: the preſent reading implies no more, than that the event happened during the preſidency of Cyrenius, the other would denote alſo that it was done by him; for ηγεμονευοντος would ſtill be a participle, and not a noun.

3. On all theſe accounts, I approve more the way ſuggeſted by Wet. for removing the difficulty, by the explanation of the verb εγενετο, than by putting the conſtruction to the torture, to wreſt a meaning from the ſentence which otherwiſe it would never yield. It is certain, that the verb γινεσθαι has, in the N. T. other ſenſes, beſide the moſt common ones, *to be, to become, to be made, to be born, to happen*. And of thoſe other meanings, leſs uſual, but ſufficiently warranted, the moſt applicable here is *to take effect*, to produce its ordinary conſequences. An example of this ſenſe we have, Mt. v. 18. εως αν παρελθη ο ουρανος και η γη, ιωτα εν η μια κεραια ου μη παρελθη απο του νομου εως αν παντα γενηται: rendered in this verſion; *Sooner ſhall heaven and earth periſh, than one iota, or one tittle of the law ſhall periſh, without attaining its end.* The laſt clauſe is to the ſame purpoſe in the E. T. *Till all be fulfilled.* From the connection of the verſe with that immediately preceding, it is evident that the verb γενεσθαι is uſed in the one, in the ſame ſenſe with πληρωσαι in the other: ουκ ηλθον καταλυσαι αλλα πληρωσαι. For the import of the word πληρωσαι, in that paſſage, ſee the note in this verſion. We have another example in the ſame Goſpel, vi. 10. γενηθητω το θελημα σου, *Thy will be done;* that is, *take effect, be executed.* The ſame phraſe occurs alſo, xxvi. 42. L. xi. 2. and nearly the ſame, xxii. 42. μη το θελημα μου, αλλα το σον γενεσθω. Again, Mt. xviii. 19. our Lord, ſpeaking of the requeſt which two or three of his diſciples ſhall agree in making, ſays γενησεται αυτοις, it ſhall be accompliſhed for them, it ſhall have the deſired effect. I ſhall produce but one other example, 1 Cor. xv. 54. τοτε γενησεται λογος ο γεγραμμενος, κατεποθη ο θανατος εις νικος: *Then that ſaying of Scripture ſhall be accompliſhed, Death is ſwallowed up of victory.* Now, let it be remarked that, in the moſt common acceptation of the verb γινομαι, a law is made, γινεται, when it is enacted, not when it is obeyed; a requeſt, when it is preſented, not when it is granted; a promiſe, when it is given, not when it is performed; a prediction, when it is announced, not when it is fulfilled. Yet it is in the latter only, though leſs common meaning, that the verb, in all the inſtances above produced, is, by the concurrent voice of all interpreters to be underſtood. There is only one ſmall point in which this ſolution appears to differ from that given by Wet. He, if I miſtake not, retains the ordinary meaning of the verb γινομαι, and, in defence of the expreſſion, argues that it is uſual to ſpeak of a thing as done by that perſon by whom it was finiſhed, although it had been begun and carried on by others. But to ſay that a buſineſs enjoined ſo early by Auguſtus, was performed ſo long after by Cyrenius, or during his government, gives immediate ſcope for the queſtion, 'Where was, then, the neceſſity that 'Joſeph ſhould make a journey to Bethelem, to be 'regiſtered, with Mary his eſpouſed wife, ten or eleven 'years before?' And even if it ſhould be expreſſed that the buſineſs was at that time completed, it might ſeem ſtrange that, in a country no larger than Judea, the execution of this order ſhould have required ſo long a time. In the way I have rendered it, both objections are obviated: the regiſter (whatever was the intention of it) was made in Herod's time, but had then little or no conſequences. When, after the depoſition and baniſhment of Archelaus, Judea was annexed to Syria, and converted into a province, the regiſter of the inhabitants, formerly taken, ſerved as a directory for laying on the *cenſus*, to which the country was then ſubjected. Not but that there muſt have happened conſiderable changes on the people during that period.

But

But the errors which theſe changes might occaſion could, with proper attention, be eaſily rectified. And thus, it might be juſtly ſaid, that an enrolment which had been made ſeveral years before, did not take effect, or produce conſequences worthy of notice, till then. This ſolution does not differ, in the reſult, from that given by Whiſton, and approved by Prideaux, but it differs in the method of educing the concluſion. Amongſt other objections to which Whiſton's method is expoſed, one is, that if the ſenſe of απογραφη had been as unconnected with that of the verb απογραφομαι, in the preceding verſe, as he makes it, the hiſtorian would not have introduced it with the demonſtrative pronoun, and ſaid, Αυτη ἡ απογραφη, which plainly refers us, for its meaning, to the verb, its conjugate, he had immediately uſed. This, upon the whole, is my opinion of this puzzling queſtion. It is, however, proper to obſerve, that I offer it only as what appears to me a plauſible way of ſolving the difficulty, without violating the ſyntax; but am far from having that confidence in it wherewith ſome critics expreſs themſelves concerning ſolutions which, to ſpeak moderately, are not leſs exceptionable.

7. *Laid him in a manger*, ανεκλινεν αυτον εν τη φατνη. Biſhop Pearce is of opinion, that by the word φατνη is here meant a bag of coarſe cloth, like thoſe out of which the horſes of our troopers are fed when encamped. This bag he ſuppoſes to have been faſtened to the wall, or ſome other part, not of the ſtable, but of the gueſt-chamber, or room for the reception of ſtrangers, where Joſeph and Mary were lodged, in which gueſt-chamber, intended ſolely for accommodating human creatures, and not cattle, there was a manger, but there was no bed; and this obliged Mary to have recourſe to the manger for laying her child in. What could have led a man of Dr. Pearce's abilities to adopt an hypotheſis ſo ill compacted, as well as unſupported, it is not eaſy to conceive. Perhaps a ſtrong prejudice againſt the notion that the mother of our Lord, ſhould, on that occaſion, have had no better accommodation than what a ſtable could afford. But in all ſuch caſes, the reflection ought ever to be preſent to our minds, that what we are enquiring into is not a matter of theory, but a point of fact; concerning the evidence of which, we ſhall never be capable of judging with impartiality, if we have allowed our minds to be preoccupied with vain conceptions, in relation to fitneſs and dignity, of which we are not competent judges. If, along with ſufficient evidence of the fact, there be nothing that contradicts the manifeſt principles of the underſtanding, or ſhocks that ſenſe of right and wrong, which is the law of God written on our hearts, we ought to be ſatisfied. For that there ſhould be things aſtoniſhing, or even unaccountable, in tranſactions ſo far ſuperior to every other object of our meditations, is what we ought in reaſon to expect, ever remembering, that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways. His Lordſhip has probably, when he wrote his remark on this verſe, had in his eye an obſervation of Mr Harmer's [ſee vol. i. p. 442. ed. 2d.], which ſays, that as the horſes in the Eaſt eat chiefly barley, they do not eat it out of a manger, as with us (for they have no mangers), but out of bags of haircloth, which are hung about their heads for that purpoſe. From the ſame obſervations Dr. Prieſtley has drawn a concluſion, in a great meaſure the reverſe, to wit, that they were all in a ſtable, but that there is no mention of a manger of any kind, the word φατνη, on his hypotheſis, meaning only *ſtable*. That the word φατνη means *ſtable*, or rather *ſtall*, as well as *manger*, is admitted. *Manger* ſeems to have been the original ſignification, and the other meaning, *ſtall*, to have ariſen from a ſynecdoché of a part for the whole, as in La. *tectum* is ſometimes uſed for *domus*, and *puppis* for *navis*; or, as in Eng. *ſail* for *ſhip*. But abſtracting from all other conſiderations, the words of the original are unfavourable to that philoſopher's interpretation; ανεκλινεν αυτον εν τη φατνη obviouſly implies, that this was the place wherein the child was laid, and whereby he was diſtinguiſhed in point of place, not only from thoſe without doors, but from thoſe within. The Doctor has indeed attempted to give ſuch a turn to the words, as may make εν τη φατνη relate in common to all the three preceding verbs, ετικεν, εσπαργανωσεν, and ανεκλινεν; but with what ſucceſs muſt be ſubmitted to the learned. To mention the laying of a child, without ſaying where, is a very blank ſort of information; and when the place is named, we expect it to be what particularly marks the ſituation of the child, and not what he has in common with thoſe who thus diſpoſe of him, and perhaps with many others. If Mary had born Jeſus in her own houſe, would it have been natural to ſay, She brought forth her firſt-born ſon, and ſwathed him, and laid him, without adding a word, ſuch as in a cradle, or on a couch, to denote where? But, if, for explanation, it had been added ſimply in the houſe, or there, we ſhould have ſurely thought the whole clauſe exceedingly ſuperfluous; for who can ſuppoſe that ſhe would have taken him to another houſe? It ſtrengthens my argument that the word φατνη occurs again twice in this chapter, and is always connected with the poſition of the child, κειμενον εν τη φατνη. Nor can it be ſaid with truth that εν τη φατνη may relate equally, as Dr. Prieſtley explains it, to all who had been named. If the word κειμενον had not been ſubjoined to βρεφος, I ſhould admit the plauſibility of this expoſition; but the participle κειμενον, as has been obſerved, requires ſome ſuch ſupplement, and conſequently appropriates what follows as the full expreſſion of the ſituation of the babe. But to return to biſhop Pearce's expoſition: on what authority a bag made of goat's hair is believed to have been called φατνη, he has not thought fit to inform us. The like contrivance amongſt ourſelves, though very common, we never call *a manger*. The very quotations produced by Dr. Pearce confute his hypotheſis. Homer repreſents the horſe as chained to the φατνη, and getting looſe from it only by breaking his chain.

Could he mean to ſay, that he had been ſecured by being bound to a haircloth bag, and not to ſome thing which he could not carry off? The quotation from Virgil is preciſely of the ſame kind, *abruptis fugit præſepia vinclis*. Thoſe bags, Harmer tells us, are hung about the heads of the cattle; but ſurely they could never occaſion the breaking of either chain or halter. It may be aſked, What ſhall we ſay then to the authorities produced by Harmer, to wit, D'Arvieux, Thevenot, and ſir John Chardin, who affirm, that they uſe no mangers in the Eaſt, unleſs we beſtow that name on the coarſe bags above deſcribed? We will ſay that we admit the teſtimony of theſe witneſſes, as evidence not only of what they ſaw themſelves, but of what was then cuſtomary in the countries which they viſited. At the ſame time, we do not admit it as evidence of what had been the practice there, near ſeventeen hundred years before, eſpecially when, as to the more ancient uſages, we have direct teſtimony that they were different. There is here no oppoſition of teſtimony. We find, therefore, no difficulty in believing both. The one concerns the practice of the ſixteenth, ſeventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the other that of the firſt century alone. To obviate this, it has been affirmed, and is doubtleſs true, that the Aſiatics are not ſo changeable as the Europeans in what regards their manners and cuſtoms. But were we to conclude thence, that they never change at all, we ſhould err more widely than if we ſhould believe them as fickle as ourſelves. The difference is only in degree. I have had occaſion, in the Preliminary Diſſertations, to indicate and to trace ſome of the changes which have obtained in opinions, in manners, and cuſtoms, and even in the import of words. Man is naturally mutable, and mutability, in ſome degree, cleaves to every thing that is human. It is indeed impoſſible that the revolutions (or changes affecting whole kingdoms and ſtates) to which Syria and the neighbouring countries have been ſubjected, ſhould not have produced great and numerous alterations in all the reſpects above-mentioned. Their conquerors too, in different ages, have moſtly been nations exceedingly different from one another, both in political principles and in religious ceremonies, the Chaldeans, the Perſians, the Grecians, the Romans, the Arabians, and laſt of all the Turks. Are changes in government, ſuch as theſe, compatible with a perfect uniformity in their fathions and cuſtoms? No certainly. Let it not, however, be imagined that I mean to depreciate ſuch obſervations as thoſe of Harmer. This is far from my intention, I know that, in many caſes, they may be very uſeful, and ſeveral of thoſe made by that learned author, undoubtedly, are ſo; but all obſervations of that kind are then moſt ſafely applied, when they throw light upon a paſſage of Scripture which, miſled by our own cuſtoms, we find obſcure; and not when they ſerve to darken what is expreſſed both plainly and explicitly. If a preſent cuſtom in the Eaſt, applied to any ancient fact recorded, makes a paſſage clear which is otherwiſe inexplicable it is a very ſtrong preſumption, and in ſome caſes even a proof, that their preſent is the continuation of their ancient practice. But let it not, on the other hand, be founded on as an axiom, that whatever is uſed at preſent in that part of the world was always ſo, or that whatever was once their faſhion, is the faſhion with them ſtill; than both which nothing can be more evidently falſe. As to the point in queſtion, the word φατνη is uſed in the Sep. as the verſion of a Heb. word, which manifeſtly denotes the manger, crib, or veſſel, in a ſtable, out of which the cattle eat. The Heb. אבוס *ebus*, which is ſo rendered, appears, both from etymology and from uſe, to be of this import. See Job xxxix. 9. Iſ. i. 3. Prov. xiv. 4. The ſame may be ſaid, with truth, of the Syriac word אורית *auria*, by which it is tranſlated in that ancient verſion; and as to the Gr. term, Phavorinus ſays, Φατνη παρα το φαγειν γινεται. But though enough has been ſaid to remove ſo ſlight a preſumption founded on their preſent cuſtoms, I ſhall, on this article, give poſitive evidence, both that the practice was in Aſia, in ancient times, to feed their cattle out of mangers, or veſſels made of durable materials, as ſtone, wood, or metal, and that it was actually in ſuch a veſſel that our Lord was laid. Firſt, that mangers were uſed in Aſia, particularly by the Perſians, of whom Harmer tells us, from Thevenot, that at preſent they have in their ſtables no ſuch implement; the authority of Herodotus will put beyond diſpute. In relating the final victory obtained by the Greeks over the Perſians, and the total expulſion of the latter out of Greece, he acquaints us that the tent of Mardonius, the commander in chief of the Perſian army, was pillaged, and that there was found in it a brazen manger for his horſes, which, on account of its ſingular beauty, was preſented to the goddeſs Alea Minerva, in whoſe temple it was depoſited. His words are [l. ix.], Την σκηνην τε Μαρδονιε ὅτοι [Τεγεηται] εσαν οι διαρπασαντες; τα τε αλλα εξ αυτης και την φατνην των ἱππων εσαν χαλκεην πασαν και θωμ αξιην· την μεν δη φατνην ταυτην την Μαρδονιε ανεθεσαν ες τον νεων της Αλεης Αθηναιης. Nobody will pretend that the hiſtorian could mean that Mardonius carried about with him a braſs ſtable for his horſes, which the Greeks found in his tent. Every circumſtance of the ſtory adds to the credibility of the fact, but more eſpecially of that point with which alone my argument is concerned. We have here the teſtimony of an hiſtorian worthy of credit, particularly in matters which fell within his own knowledge, which, when he wrote, were recent in reſpect of time, and in reſpect of place, tranſacted on the moſt public theatre, at that time in the world; a teſtimony, beſides, with the beſt means of confuting which, if it had been falſe, he furniſhed his contemporaries, by telling them where this curious piece of furniture was to be ſeen. Now, let it be obſerved, that this ſtory is ſtill ſtronger evidence that the Perſians were then accuſtomed to the uſe of mangers, than it is of the particular fact related. Had it anſwered any purpoſe to the hiſtorian to tell a falſehood, he would never have contrived a falſehood notoriouſly

dictory to the Perſian cuſtoms, at that time well known in Greece. Neither could he himſelf be ignorant of their cuſtoms. Not to mention his extenſive knowledge, he was an Aſiatic, a native and citizen of Halicarnaſſus, a city of Caria in Aſia Minor, and conſequently in the neighbourhood of the Perſian dominions. To this teſtimony I ſhall add that of Juſtin Martyr, the firſt of the Fathers after the diſciples of the Apoſtles; he wrote about the middle of the ſecond century. He ſays expreſsly, that when Joſeph could find no place in the village of Bethlehem to lodge in, he betook himſelf to a cave near it, and that, when they were there, Mary bore the Meſſiah, and laid him in a manger. His words are [Dial. cum Tryphone], Επειδη Ιωσηφ ουκ ειχεν εν τη κωμη εκεινη που καταλυσαι, εν σπηλαιω τινι συνεγγυς της κωμης κατιλυσε, και τοτε αυτων ουτως ουσων, ετεκεν ὁ Μαρια τον χριστον και εν φατνη αυτον ετιθεικει. Now, nothing can be more evident than that here the σπηλαιον, where Joſeph and Mary were lodged, is diſtinguiſhed from the φατνη where ſhe laid the infant. Such natural caves as could in a ſtrait afford ſhelter both to men and cattle, were not uncommon in that country; and a principle of humanity or of hoſpitality, for which the ancients were remarkable, might influence the people to beſtow ſome labour upon them, in order to render them more commodious. This, at leaſt, is not an implauſible way of accounting for their finding a manger, and perhaps ſome other conveniences, in ſuch a place. But, whatever be in this, for I am nowiſe intereſted to promote the credit of the tradition, though very ancient; and though Origen, who wrote in the third century, confirms it, telling us, that at Bethlehem they ſhowed the cave wherein Jeſus was born, and the manger in the cave wherein he was ſwathed (contra Celſum, Δεικνυται το εν Βηθλεεμ σπηλαιον ενθα εγεννηθη, και ὁ εν τω σπηλαιω φατνη εν ᾧ εσπαργανωθη); from theſe teſtimonies it is very evident, that in thoſe days ſuch implements in a ſtable, as we call *mangers*, were well known, and in common uſe in Judea. For, let it be remembered, that Juſtin was a native of Paleſtine, having been born in Neapolis of Samaria, the city which, in Scripture, is called *Shechem* and *Sichar*. Origen alſo had lived ſome time in the country. In which way ſoever, therefore, we underſtand the ſtory of the cave related by Juſtin, as a fiction, or as a fact, it is a full proof that they were not then unacquainted with the uſe of mangers.

7. *In the houſe allotted to ſtrangers*, εν τω καταλυματι E. T. *In the inn.* I ſhall, here, not only for the vindication of the verſion, but for the further illuſtration of the whole paſſage, make a few obſervations on the houſes built in the Eaſt, for the reception of ſtrangers. Buſbequius, ambaſſador at the Porte, from the emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian, a man well acquainted with the Turkiſh polity and manners, both in Europe and in Aſia, where, on the public ſervice, he had alſo occaſion to be, mentions (Epiſ. 1.) three ſorts of houſes built for the accommodation of travellers. The firſt is the *caravanſary*, the moſt conſiderable, and that which, from its external magnificence, is the moſt apt to attract the attention of ſtrangers. *It is*, ſays Buſbequius, *a very large building*; commonly lighted from the top, either by ſky-lights, or by a ſpacious dome, which ſerves for ornament, as well as uſe. Into this edifice, which is all under one roof, and has no partitions, all travellers, and their cattle, are admitted promiſcuouſly. The only diviſion in it, is an area in the middle for the ſervants, the beaſts, and the baggage, incloſed with a parapet, three feet high, which is ſo broad as to reach the wall of the houſe on every ſide, and thus to form a ſtone bench all along the walls, for accommodating the travellers, and railing them above the level of the horſes, camels, and mules. This bench is commonly from four to ſix feet broad. There are chimneys, at proper diſtances, in the walls. Every little party has ſuch a proportion of this bench, with a chimney, as muſt ſerve for kitchen, parlour, and bed-chamber. They uſe the proviſions which they bring with them, or which they purchaſe in the place. At night the ſaddle-cloth, and their own upper garments, commonly ſerve for bed-clothes, and the ſaddle for a pillow. The public ſupplies them only in lodging. The account given by this Imperial miniſter, in the ſixteenth century, does not materially differ, in any thing, from what is related by Tournefort, and other travellers of the preſent age. Buſbequius calls the ſecond ſort of public houſe *Xenodochium*, which, he ſays, is only to be found in a few places. The former is intended chiefly for the accommodation of thoſe travelling companies, called *caravans*, from which it derives its name; the latter receives no cattle, nor are the ſtrangers huddled together as in the caravanſary, but are decently accommodated in ſeparate apartments, and ſupplied at the public charge for three days, if they chuſe to ſtay ſo long, in moderate but wholeſome food. The third he calls *ſtabulum*, and of this kind he mentions ſome as very capacious, though not ſo magnificent as the caravanſary. Here alſo the travellers and their cattle were under the ſame roof, and not ſeparated by any partition-wall from each other. Only the former poſſeſſed the one ſide, which had at leaſt one chimney, and the latter the other. When he himſelf, in travelling, was forced to put up with ſuch quarters (for this ſometimes happened), he tells us that he made the curtains of his tent ſerve for a partition between him and the other travellers. Now, of the three ſorts, it is probable that theſe two only, the *xenodochium* and the *ſtabulum*, were known in the days of the Apoſtles. Indeed the firſt mentioned, the *caravanſary*, appears no other than an improvement of the *ſtabulum*, the plan being much enlarged, and perhaps a few accommodations added; of all which it is likely that the annual pilgrimages to Mecca, after the eſtabliſhment of Mahometiſm in the Eaſt, firſt ſuggeſted the neceſſity. Of the two other kinds there appear ſuch traces in Scripture as render it at leaſt credible that they were both in common uſe. The καταλυμα, mentioned twice by this Evangeliſt, once by Mr. and occurring ſometimes in the

Sep.

Sep. anſwers to the *xenodochium* of Buſbequius; the πανδοχειον of L. in conformity to its name, correſponds to the *ſtabulum* of the other. It is accordingly ſo rendered in the Vul. whereas *diverſorium* is that by which καταλυμα is rendered in that tranſlation. All the later tranſlators into La. Er. Ar. Zu. Caſ. and Be. leſs properly confound theſe words, rendering both *diverſorium*. In caſes of this kind, immediately depending on the cuſtoms of a country, the old tranſlator who, from his vicinity in time and place, had the beſt opportunity of knowing the cuſtoms, is entitled to the preference. It deſerves our notice alſo, that the ancient Sy. never confounds the two words. In this, therefore, I agree with Biſhop Pearce, that πανδοχειον and καταλυμα are not ſynonymous. As the ſame diſtinction, however, does not obtain with us which obtained with them, we have not names exactly correſponding; but there is reſemblance enough in the chief particulars to make the term *inn* a tolerable verſion of the word πανδοχειον, but not of καταλυμα; for that cannot be called an *inn* where the lodgers are at no charges, which was moſt probably the caſe of the καταλυμα. It was neceſſary that there ſhould be at Jeruſalem, whither the three great feſtivals brought regularly, thrice in the year, an immenſe concourſe of people, very many of the former kind, the καταλυματα. There was but one καταλυμα, it ſeems, at Bethlehem, a ſmall village, and, when Joſeph came thither, it was full. For this reaſon, the pious pair, if they did not betake themſelves to the cave, according to the tradition abovementioned, muſt have had recourſe to the homely harbourage of a πανδοχειον, or *ſtabulum*. This, in my opinion, removes every difficulty, and is perfectly conſiſtent with every circumſtance related by the Evangeliſt. The place was not properly a *ſtable*, in our ſenſe of the word, a houſe only for cattle, but was intended for ſupplying travellers, as to this day they are ſupplied in the Eaſt, with both ſtable and lodging. Nor did it belong to what is called the καταλυμα, the houſe allotted for the reception of ſtrangers, with which it had no connection. They were different kinds of what, in old language, were called *hoſtelries*, and quite independent on each other. By this explanation, without needing to recur to a cave without the town (an hypotheſis liable to ſome obvious objections), we can admit Wet.'s reaſoning, in all its force. "If," ſays he, "the manger was a "part of the ſtable, and the ſtable a part of the "inn, he who had room in the ſtable had room in "the inn. When Luke, therefore, ſays, that there "was no room for them in the inn, he ſhows that "the ſtable was unconnected with the inn." The pains that has been taken by ſome learned men to furniſh our Lord and his parents on this occaſion with better quarters, I cannot help thinking, ſavours ſomewhat of that ancient prejudice called *the ſcandal of the croſs*, which has clung to our religion from the beginning, and which, in the firſt ages, produced all the extravagancies of the Docetæ, and many others. This prejudice, wherever it prevails, diſplays a wonderful dexterity in removing, or at leaſt weakening, thoſe circumſtances in the hiſtory of our Lord, which are, in the world's account, humiliating. It is an amazing conceit, in a man of Wet.'s abilities, to fancy that there was more dignity in our Lord's being born in a cave than in a ſtable, becauſe, forſooth, the fables of idolaters repreſent Rhea as having brought forth Jupiter in a cave. "A cave," ſays he, "has ſomething in it venerable and divine, where- "as nothing is more deſpicable and ruſtic than a "ſtable." *Antrum nobis aliquid venerandum et divinum :, ſtabulum vero humile et ruſticum repræſentat.* To remarks of this kind, ſo unſuitable to the ſpirit of our religion, it is ſufficient to anſwer in the words of our Lord [L. xvi. 15.], Το εν ανθρωποις υψηλον, βδελυγμα ενωπιον του Θεου εστι.

9. *A divine glory*, δοξα κυριε. E. T. *The glory of the Lord.* It was a known figure among the Hebrews, to raiſe, by the name of God, the import of any thing mentioned, to the higheſt degree poſſible. See the note on verſe 40th.

14. *In the higheſt heaven*, εν τοις υψιστοις. E. T. *In the higheſt.* It is not agreeable to the Eng. idiom to uſe an adjective ſo indefinitely as the word *higheſt*, without a ſubſtantive, would be in this place. When it is employed as a name of God, the context never fails to ſhow the meaning, and thereby remove all appearance of impropriety. As the Jews reckoned three heavens, *the higheſt* was conſidered as the place of the throne of God. When we find it contraſted with earth, as in this verſe, we have reaſon to aſſign it this meaning; the one is mentioned as the Habitation of God, the other as that of men. This is entirely in the Jewiſh manner. *God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth* (Ecl. v. 2.). *Thy will be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven* (Mt. vi. 10.) The plural number is uſed in the original, becauſe the Heb. word for *heaven* is never in the ſingular.

14. *Peace upon the earth, and good will towards men*, επι γης ειρηνη, εν ανθρωποις ευδοκια. Vul. *In terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.* The La. verſion is evidently founded on a different reading of the original. Accordingly, in the Al. and Cam. MSS. but in no other, we find ευδοκιας in the genitive. The Go. and the Sax. are the only tranſlations which, with the Vul. favour this reading. Since the paſſage, as commonly read, admits a meaning, at leaſt as clear and appoſite as that which we find in the Vul. and as the authorities which ſupport the former are incomparably ſuperior, both in number and in value, to thoſe which favour the latter, it is plain that no change ought to be made. I do not think it an objection of any weight againſt the common reading, that the copulative is wanting before the laſt member. It would have ſome weight in ſimple narrative, but in a doxology, ſuch as this, has none at all. The Sy. indeed, has the conjunction prefixed to this clauſe as well as

to

to the preceding; but as there is not for this the authority of any Gr. MS. it has probably been inferted by the tranſlator, merely to render the expreſſion more complete. In the way the paſſage is rendered in the Vul. it is difficult to ſay, with any degree of confidence, what is the meaning. The moſt likely, when we conſider the ordinary import of the words in Scripture, is that which may be expreſſed in this manner, *peace upon the earth to the men whom God favoureth.* This ſenſe, however, it muſt be owned, does but ill ſuit the context, in which the angels are repreſented as ſaying, that the good news which they bring ſhall prove matter of great joy to all the people. It ought ſurely, in that caſe, to have been ſaid only to ſome of the people, namely, to thoſe whom God favoureth. That none can enjoy true peace whom God does not favour, is manifeſt; but then, by the firſt expreſſion, we are taught, that God, in ſending the Meſſiah, favours all the people; by the ſecond, that he favours only a part. Though theſe different ſentiments may, perhaps, on different views of the ſubject, both be juſtified; yet, as there is nothing here to ſuggeſt a different view, the moſt conſiſtent interpretation is the moſt probable. *The peace of good-will*, which biſhop Pearce has propoſed in interpreting the words, is an unſcriptural, and I even think, unnatural, expreſſion.

19. *Weighing*, συμβαλλουσα. Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Conferens.* Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe, *Perpendens.* Elſner has produced a number of examples from Pagan authors, to prove that the word συμβαλλουσα may be here moſt fitly rendered into La. *Mentem eorum probè aſſecuta*, having attained the underſtanding of them. He is in this followed by Palairet; only the latter prefers rendering the word more ſimply, *intelligens*, underſtanding them. Raphelius has ſhown that, if we were to inſpect the places whence Elſner's examples were taken, we ſhould find, both from the ſentence itſelf, and from the context, that the verb is at leaſt as ſuſceptible of one or other of theſe ſignifications, *to weigh, to compare, to conjecture*, as of that which he gives it. I confeſs, that to me it appears much more ſuſceptible of this ſenſe than of the other. Wet. ſeems to have been of the ſame opinion. After producing many ſimilar quotations, from Grecian authors, which manifeſtly yield a good and appoſite meaning ſo interpreted, he concludes with obſerving, "De conjectoribus et interpretibus ſemniorum oraculorumque "dicitur." Here I cannot avoid making a few obſervations on the manner in which authorities are ſometimes alleged by critics. They ſeem to think that, if the words of a quotation, taken by themſelves, make ſenſe, when interpreted in the way they propoſe it is ſufficient evidence that they have given the meaning of the author in that place. Now this is, in reality, no evidence at all. That ſuch an interpretation yields *a ſenſe*, is one thing, that it yields *the ſenſe*, of the author, is another. Of two different meanings, the chief conſideration, which can reaſonably aſcertain the preference, is, when one clearly ſuits the ſcope of the author, and the connection of the paragraph, and the other does not. Yet, if the ſentence be conſidered independently, it may make ſenſe either way explained. That this is the caſe with Elſner's examples, wherein the verb συμβαλλειν is equally capable of being tranſlated *to gueſs* as *to underſtand*, I ſhould think it loſing time to illuſtrate. The judicious critic, when he conſiders the connection, will find them, if I miſtake not, more capable of being rendered in the former way than in the latter. They all relate to dreams and oracles, concerning which, the heathens themſelves admitted that there could be no certain knowledge. I obſerve, 2dly, That, in criticiſing the inſpired writers, whoſe manner is, in many reſpects, peculiar, I ſhould think it exceedingly obvious, that the firſt recourſe for authorities ought to be to the writer himſelf, or to the other ſacred penmen who employ the word in queſtion. [Diſſ. IV. § 4—8.] The only writer in the N. T. who uſes the verb συμβαλλω is L. In five places, beſide this, he has employed it; but in none of the five, will it admit the ſenſe which Elſner aſſigns it here. The ſame thing may be affirmed, with truth, concerning thoſe paſſages wherein it occurs in the Sep. and the Apocrypha. Need I add, that the Sy. verſion, which renders the word in this place מחשבת perfectly agrees with the Vul.? Indeed, as far as the ſenſe is concerned, I do not recollect to have obſerved any difference among tranſlators; and that even Mary did not underſtand every thing relating to her ſon, we learn from the 50th verſe of this chapter. I ſhall only further obſerve in paſſing (but I do not lay any ſtreſs on this as an argument), that it is not in the manner of the ſacred writers to celebrate the abilities of the ſaints, but their virtues. Whenever they commend, they hold forth an object of imitation to their readers. The underſtanding of this excellent perſonage was merely an ability or talent; but her weighing every thing that related to this moſt important ſubject, and carefully treaſuring it up in her memory, was an evidence of her piety, and of the ardent deſire ſhe had to learn the things of God. This is a thing imitable by others; but neither natural acuteneſs of underſtanding, nor ſupernatural gifts, can properly be objects of imitation to us.

22. *Their purification*, καθαρισμω αυτων. E. T. *Her purification.* Vul. *Purgationis ejus.* In a very few Gr. copies, there is a diverſity of reading. The Cam. and three others of leſs note, for αυτων read αυτη, thus making it *his purification.* The Com. which has in this been followed by Be. and the two printers, Plantin and Elzevir, read αυτης, *her.* The Cop and Arm. verſions omit the pronoun altogether. Wet. has claſſed the Vul. as ſupporting the few Gr. MSS. which read αυτη, *his*, and I cannot help thinking him in the right. *Ejus* is of itſelf equivocal, meaning either *his* or *her.* Which of the two is meant, in a particular caſe, muſt always be learnt from the connexion of the words. Now the pronoun is ſo con-

nected here as, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, not to admit another meaning than *his*. Mary is not mentioned in the foregoing verse, nor even in that which preceded it. The last time she is mentioned is in v. 19. relating to a quite different matter. Jesus is mentioned in the words immediately preceding; and the same personal pronoun occurs in the two verses, both before and after, referring to him. But the verses themselves in the Vul. will make this evident without a comment, *Et postquam consummati sunt dies octo, ut circumcideretur puer; vocatum est nomen ejus Jesus, quod vocatum est ab angelo, priusquam in utero conciperetur. Et postquam impleti sunt dies purgationis ejus secundum legem Moysi, tulerunt illum in Jerusalem, ut sisterent eum Domino.* Be this, however, as it will, all the translations from the Vul. which I have seen, consider *ejus*, as in this place, feminine. Were the question, what, in our judgment, the expression should be, and not what it actually is (questions often confounded by the critics), I should, for obvious reasons, strongly incline, as others have done, to read αυτης, *her*, in preference to all other readings. But I must acknowledge that, upon examination, it appears to be that reading which, of all those above mentioned, has the least support from positive evidence. I should rather say it has none at all. Not a single MS. is there, not one ancient writer, or old translation, if we except the Vul.; and how equivocal its testimony in this place is, has been shown already. For my part, I rather consider it, with Wet. as one witness for the reading in the Cam. All the evidence then is reduced to cardinal Ximenes, who will not be thought of great weight with those who consider the freedoms which he sometimes took, in order to produce in his Gr. edition a closer conformity to the Vul. Be. does not pretend the authority of MSS. for his following, in this passage, the Com. His only reason is the incongruity which he found in the ordinary reading, αυτων. Nor is it of any weight that some printers followed, in this, his edition. Let us then consider briefly, but impartially, those apparent incongruities in the common reading, which make people so unwilling to receive it. One is, it is not conformable to the style of the law of Moses on this subject. The purification after child-birth is never called the purification of the child, but of the mother. Though this is certainly true, it may be justly affirmed that it is conformable to the spirit of the law to consider what may be called the legal state of the mother, and of the child suckled by her, as the same. Now, though the uncleanness of the mother, after bearing a male child, lasted only seven days, she remained thirty-three days longer debarred from touching any hallowed thing, or going into the sanctuary. Nor could the first-born male be legally presented to the Lord, and redeemed, till he was a month old at least. But as the time was not, like that of circumcision, fixed to a particular day, it is not unlikely that it may have been customary, because convenient, for those who lived at a distance from Jerusalem, to allot the same time for the purification and the redemption (as was actually done in this case), and to consider the ceremonies in a complex view, as regarding both mother and child. The only other objection which operates powerfully against the reception of the common reading, is, that it appears to attribute impurity of some kind or other to our Lord Jesus, from which he needed to be cleansed. But nothing is more certain than what is observed by Gro. that this, notwithstanding its name, implied no more than certain restraints upon the person, till after the performance of certain rites. We are apt to connect with the notion of impurity, or the uncleanness described in the ceremonial law, some some degree of guilt or moral pravity. But this is entirely without foundation. There was an uncleanness contracted by the touch of a dead body; but this being often unavoidable, and sometimes accidental, it was not in any sense a transgression, unless in a few particular cases. It would have been indeed a transgression, if voluntary, in the high priest, because to him expressly prohibited. His sacred functions required that the necessary care about the interment of persons deceased, though nearly connected with him, should be committed to other hands. The ordinary priests, however, were allowed to defile themselves for near relations. And, as they were permitted, their defilement, in such cases, was no transgression, and consequently implied no sin. Nay more, in many cases it was a man's duty to defile himself in the sense of the ceremonial law. Nobody will deny that it was necessary, and therefore a duty, to take care of the dying, and to bury the dead. Yet this duty could not be performed without occasioning uncleanness. Nay, the ceremonial law itself required the doing of that which produced this defilement. The priest and others, employed in sacrificing and burning the red heifer, and gathering her ashes, were all rendered unclean by what they did, yet they were obliged by law to do it. Num. xix. 7, 8. 10. It was, therefore, in some cases a man's duty to make himself unclean. If, indeed, a person in this state had entered the congregation of the Lord, or touched any thing intentionally, and without necessity, not permitted to such, or had neglected to use in due time the rites of cleansing, he would, by this presumption, have rendered himself a transgressor, but not by what is called defiling himself, which the ceremonial law allowed in many cases, and which, in some cases, the moral law, or law of nature, nay even, the ceremonial law, required.

23. *Every male who is the first-born of his mother,* πας αρσην διανοιγον μητραν. Dod. *Every first-born male.* I should, probably, have adopted this expression of Dod. as briefer, if there did not appear an ambiguity in it, which is not in the other. A son may, not improperly, be called the first-born male, who is born before all the other male children of the family, notwithstanding that there may have been one or more females born before him. And if I mistake not, we frequently use the phrase in this meaning. But such a child is not πρωτοτοκος μητρας, and,

conſequently, not a male who is the *firſt-born*, in the ſenſe of this law, which takes place only when the the firſt child which a woman bears is a male. There is the greater reaſon for remarking the difference, becauſe the Jews, themſelves, made a diſtinction between the firſt-born, when it denotes the heir or perſon entitled to a double portion of his father's eſtate, and to ſome other privileges; and the firſt-born, when it denotes a perſon who is conſecrated to God by his birth, and muſt in due time be redeemed. Such were, upon the old conſtitution, before God ſelected for himſelf the tribe of Levi in their ſtead, deſtined for the prieſthood. Now, this ſacred prerogative did not always coincide with the civil rights of primogeniture. Unleſs the child was at once the firſt-born of his mother, and the eldeſt ſon of his father in lawful wedlock, he was not entitled to the civil rights of the firſt-born, or a double portion of the inheritance. He might, nevertheleſs, be a firſt-born ſon in the religious ſenſe, and ſubjected to this law of conſecration and redemption. The patriarch Jacob had, by different wives, two ſons, Reuben and Joſeph, each of whom came under the deſcription here given of αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν, and ſo was conſecrated by his birth. But Reuben alone was entitled to the patrimony of the firſt-born (if he had not forfeited it by his criminal behaviour), as being the firſt fruits of both parents. (See Gen. xlix. 3, 4. 1 Chron. v. 1, 2.) It is worthy of remark that, on Reuben's forfeiture, even the civil prerogative, the double portion, did not deſcend, according to our notions of ſeniority, to the ſon next in age to Reuben; *for*, ſays the ſacred hiſtorian, *he* [Reuben] *was the firſt-born; but foraſmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birth-right was given unto the ſons of Joſeph.* This does not appear to have happened in conſequence of a particular deſtination in Joſeph's favour, elſe it is probable that, in the hiſtory, notice would have been taken of that circumſtance, but, on the failure of Reuben, to have fallen to Joſeph in courſe. Now, according to the European rules of ſucceſſion, all the other ſons of Jacob by Leah, to wit, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Iſſachar, and Zebulun, as being elder than Joſeph, had a preferable title. But elderſhip is one thing, and primogeniture another. When there was no claim to primogeniture in a family; as, when the only firſt-born was a female, or had died; the double portion came, of courſe, to the ſenior brother. In regard to Dan the firſt-born of Bilhah, and Gad the firſt born of Zilpah, not only had they no title to the civil rights of primogeniture, but it is even doubtful, by reaſon of the ſervile condition of the mothers, whether they could be accounted *holy* by their birth. It is univerſally admitted that Iſaac, though the younger ſon, being the child of a free woman, while Iſhmael, the elder ſon, was the child of a ſlave, was alone entitled to all the prerogatives of primogeniture, both ſacred and civil. A Gentile mother is alſo, by the Rabbies, deemed incapable of conveying the rights of the firſt-born of either kind to her offspring. Any glaring deformity, a defect or redundancy in any of the members, effectually diveſted the firſt-born of his ſacred character, but not of his patrimonial birth-right. A number of caſes have been put by the Rabbies, which are more curious than important, in order to ſhow when the two ſpecies of rights coincided in the ſame individual, and when they did not. But they are not, in every thing, unanimous on this ſubject; and their deciſions, though ſpecious, are not always ſatisfactory. See Selden, lib. De ſucceſſionibus, &c. ad leges Ebræorum, cap. vii.

23. *Is conſecrated to the Lord*, αγιον τω κυριω κληθησεται. E. T. *Shall be called holy to the Lord.* P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. *ſera conſacré au Seigneur.* An. *Shall be conſecrated to the Lord.* It has been frequently obſerved, and juſtly, that *to be called*, and *to be*, often mean the ſame thing in the Hebrew idiom. The word *called* has, with them, in ſuch caſes, nearly the import of the Eng. words *held, acknowledged, accounted.* Now, that a thing is acknowledged to be of a particular kind, is conſidered as a conſequence of its being of that kind, previouſly to the acknowledgment. It follows, that if, in tranſlating in ſuch ſentences, the verb καλεω be entirely dropt, and the epithet *holy* be ſupplied by the participle perfect of an active verb, the future tenſe cannot be retained, without turning a ſimple declaration of what is, into a command of ſomething to be done. *To conſecrate*, doubtleſs, gives a more perſpicuous ſenſe, in Eng. than *to call holy.* Yet, *ſhall be conſecrated* would, in this place, imply more than is implied in the original. It would imply an order for the performance of ſome ſolemn ceremony of conſecration, ſuch, for example, as was uſed when God commanded Moſes to conſecrate Aaron and his ſons. This future, thus employed, has, in our language, the effect of the imperative: whereas, in the preſent inſtance, it is manifeſtly the intention of the writer to inform us, that this ſingle circumſtance, in the birth of a male, that he is the firſt-born of his mother, does, of itſelf, conſecrate him. In ſuch caſes, therefore, the words are more accurately, as well as perſpicuouſly, rendered, *is conſecrated*, than *ſhall be conſecrated to the Lord.* In the former way the words appear, as they ought, not a precept, but an affirmation. If, inſtead of a participle, an adjective be employed, the future may, without impropriety, be retained. The verſions of Hey. and Weſ. are both good. The firſt ſays, *ſhall be held ſacred to the Lord;* the ſecond, *ſhall be holy to the Lord.* In neither of theſe is there any appearance of a command of what is to be done; each is a diſtinct declaration of what obtains in every ſuch inſtance.

24. *A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons.* This was the offering required from the poor. Thoſe in better circumſtances were commanded to bring a lamb of the firſt year, for a burnt offering, and a turtle-dove, or a young pigeon, for a ſin offering.

30, 31. *The*

30, 31. *The Saviour whom thou haſt provided,* το σωτηριον σου ὁ ητοιμασας. E. T. *Thy ſalvation which thou haſt prepared.* In every language, we ſometimes meet with ſuch tropes as the abſtract for the concrete, the cauſe for the effect, and the like. In the Oriental tongues, however, they ſeem to be more common than in moſt others. Thus, God is called our defence, our ſong, our hope; that is, our defender, the ſubject of our ſong, the object of our hope. But when, in any occurrence, the words literally tranſlated appear but ill adapted to the idiom of our tongue, or occaſion obſcurity, it is better to expreſs the ſenſe in plain words.

38. *To all thoſe in Jeruſalem who expected deliverance,* τοις προσδεχομενοις λυτρωσιν εν Ἱερουσαλημ. E. T. *To all them that looked for redemption in Jeruſalem.* Vul. *Omnibus qui expectabant redemptionem Iſrael.* This verſion is evidently founded on a different reading. It is favoured by the Vat. which is ſingular, in having τω Ισραηλ for εν Ἱερουσαλημ. Three MSS. of ſmall account, read εν τω Ισραηλ. The Al. and two others of leſs note, read Ἱερουσαλημ, without the prepoſition, and thus make the meaning, *the deliverance of Jeruſalem.* This reading is followed by the Sy. Go. Sax. and Cop. verſions. As theſe differences make no material alteration on the ſenſe, and as the common reading is incomparably better ſupported than any other, and entirely ſuited to the ſcope of the paſſage, it is, in every reſpect, entitled to the preference. The expectation of the Meſſiah, though very general, was not univerſal.

40. *Adorned with a divine graceſulneſs,* χαρις Θεου ην επ' αυτω. E. T. *The grace of God was upon him.* A verbal tranſlation ſometimes expreſſes the ſenſe with ſufficient clearneſs; and ſometimes, though obſcure or equivocal, it is not more ſo than the original. In either caſe, it admits a plauſible apology: but here, I imagine, the words of the Evangeliſt will, to a diſcerning reader, ſuggeſt a meaning which can hardly be ſaid to be conveyed to any, by what is called the literal verſion. The word χαρις has, in Scripture, ſeveral ſignifications, to which there is not one Eng. word that will, in all caſes, anſwer. Our tranſlators have been as attentive to uniformity as moſt others; yet, for this word, which is oftenеſt rendered *grace*, they have, on different occaſions, employed one or other of the following, *favour, liberality, benefit, gift, ſake, cauſe, pleaſure, thank, thankworthy, acceptable;* and even theſe are not all. Let it not be concluded hence, that the Gr. word muſt be very equivocal and indefinite. Notwithſtanding the aforeſaid remark, it is very rarely ſo. But it is commonly the words in immediate connection, which, in all languages, limit the acceptation of one another, and put the meaning beyond a doubt. The word *grace*, in Eng. admits a conſiderable latitude of ſignification, as well as the Gr. χαρις, yet is ſeldom ſo ſituated as to appear, to the intelligent, liable to be miſunderſtood. A reader of diſcernment will be ſenſible, that uſe in the language as truly fixes theſe limits, as it does the common acceptation of words, or the rules of inflection and conſtruction. I have preferred *graceſulneſs*, in the verſion of this paſſage, as more explicit; though it cannot be denied that the word *grace* often bears the ſame meaning. Nay, I muſt add that, in this ſenſe, it correſponds to the moſt common meaning of the Gr. term in claſſical writers. But this is a ſenſe which, though not ſo common, is not without precedent in the ſacred penmen, and particularly in this Evangeliſt. In ch. iv. 22. of this Goſpel, the term is manifeſtly uſed in the ſame meaning: Εθαυμαζον επι τοις λογοις της χαριτος τοις εκπορευομενοις εκ του στοματος αυτου; here rendered, *Were aſtoniſhed at the words, full of grace, which he uttered.* The charms of his elocution, which had an irreſiſtible effect, on the hearers, are evidently here pointed out. *Gracious words*, in the common tranſlation, are not at all ſuited to the ſcope of the paſſage. See the note on that place. The word appears to me to be uſed in the ſame ſenſe, Acts iv. 33. where the hiſtorian, ſpeaking of the teſtimony which the Apoſtles gave in behalf of their Maſter, when they entered on their miniſtry, ſays, Χαρις τε μεγαλη ην επι παντας αυτους; to denote the divine eloquence wherewith they expreſſed themſelves, agreeably to the promiſe of their Lord, that they ſhould receive a mouth and wiſdom, which all their adverſaries ſhould not be able to withſtand. In like manner, I take this to be the import of the word, Acts vii. 10. where Stephen ſays of the Patriarch Joſeph, Ὁ Θεος εδωκεν αυτω χαριν και σοφιαν ενωπιον Φαραω. I acknowledge that our tranſlators have, not implauſibly, rendered the words, *God gave him favour and wiſdom in the ſight of Pharaoh.* It is, however, more probable, and more agreeable to the rules of intepretation, that the gifts, χαριν και σοφιαν, thus coupled, ſhould be underſtood as denoting diſtinct perſonal talents beſtowed, on Joſeph and not that only one of them, σοφιαν, ſhould expreſs a perſonal quality, and that χαριν ſhould denote, barely the effect of the other, or that affection which the diſcovery of his wiſdom would procure him. The ſenſe, therefore, in my opinion, is, that God united in Joſeph, that diſcernment, which qualified him for giving the beſt counſel, with thoſe graces of elocution, which conciliated favour, and produced perſuaſion. Χαρις is alſo uſed in this manner by the Apoſtle Paul, Eph. iv. 29. Col. iv. 6. The addition of Θεος to χαρις, makes, in the Hebrew idiom, a kind of ſuperlative, raiſing the ſignification as much as poſſible. For χαρις is not, like πιστις, expreſſive merely of a mental quality, but refers to effects both outward and ſenſible. (See Mr. xi. 22. N.) Thus, αστειος τω Θεω, applied to Moſes, Acts vii. 20. when an infant, ſignifies *extremely beautiful.* As ſuch expreſſions denote the higheſt degree of a valuable quality, they have, doubtleſs, ariſen from the conviction, that God is to be regarded as the ſource whence every good and perfect gift deſcends. Wet. gives, in effect, the ſame explanation of this paſſage. For further confirming the verſion here given, it may be alſo obſerved, that when

when the Evangeliſts ſay any thing in relation to the characters of the perſons of whom they write (which is but ſeldom), their words, rightly explained, will always be found to convey a preciſe and diſtinct ſentiment, and not to prove expreſſions merely indefinite, of what is good or bad in general. Now, the common verſion of this paſſage is exactly ſuch a vague expreſſion. For, to ſay that χαρις here means favour, is to ſay that the hiſtorian tells us nothing which we are not told verſe 52. where it is ſaid *he advanced in favour with God and man.* Now, I do not find that theſe writers are chargeable with ſuch repetitions, ſo quickly recurring. Beſides, in this acceptation, the phraſe would not be, χαρις ην επ' αυτω, but ευρε χαριν ενωπιον του Θεου, or παρα τω Θεω, και προς τον λαον. The thing to which, in my judgment, the hiſtorian here particularly points, is that graceful dignity in our Lord's manuer which at once engaged the love, and commanded the reſpect, of all who heard him. To this we find ſeveral alluſions made in theſe writings. See Mt. vii. 28, 29. Mr. i. 22. L. iv. 22. 32. J. vii. 46. All theſe paſſages, put together, indicate an authority, in his manner ſuperior to human, blended with the moſt condeſcending ſweetneſs. With this diſtinguiſhing quality the Evangeliſt here acquaints us that Jeſus was attended from his childhood.

44. *In the company,* εν τη συνοδια. Συνοδια means, properly, *a company of travellers.* As at the three great feſtivals, all the men who were able, were obliged, and many women choſe, at leaſt at the paſſover, to attend the celebration at Jeruſalem, they were wont, for their greater ſecurity againſt the attacks of robbers on the road, to travel in large companies. All who came, not only from the ſame city, but from the ſame canton or diſtrict, made one company. They carried neceſſaries along with them, and tents for their lodging at night. Sometimes, in hot weather, they travelled all night, and reſted in the day. This is nearly the manner of travelling, in the Eaſt, to this hour. Such companies they now call *caravans,* and, in ſeveral places, have got houſes fitted up for their reception, called *caravanſaries.* See N. on v. 7. This account of their manner of travelling, furniſhes a ready anſwer to the queſtion, How could Joſeph and Mary, make a day's journey, without diſcovering, before night, that Jeſus was not in the company? In the day time, we may reaſonably preſume, that the travellers would, as occaſion, buſineſs, or inclination, led them, mingle with different parties of their friends and acquaintance; but that, in the evening, when they were about to encamp, every one would join the family to which he belonged. As Jeſus did not appear, when it was growing late, his parents firſt ſought him where they ſuppoſed he would moſt probably be, amongſt his relations and acquaintance, and not finding him, returned to Jeruſalem.

48. *But they who ſaw him were amazed,* και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν. E. T. *And when they ſaw him, they were amazed;* that is, when Joſeph and Mary (mentioned verſe 43.) ſaw him. This is the common way of rendering the words, and they are doubtleſs ſuſceptible of this interpretation; but they are alſo ſuſceptible of that here given. This is taken notice of by Bowyer, as an expoſition ſuggeſted by Markland. Indeed, if the article had been prefixed to ιδοντες, I ſhould not have thought the words capable of any other meaning. As they ſtand, the omiſſion, eſpecially after πας or παντες, and a participle in the nominative, with the article, is not unprecedented. Thus, Mt. xi. 28. Δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι, καγω αναπαυσω υμας. It may, indeed, be objected that, in this example, both the participles are to be underſtood as relating to the ſame perſons; in which caſe, the repetition of the article would hardly be proper. This, I acknowledge, may be the caſe, but the ſuppreſſion of the article will not be admitted as ſufficient evidence that it is. For, in L. xiv. 11. where we read, πας ο υψων εαυτον ταπεινωθησεται, και ταπεινων εαυτον υψωθησεται, the two participles, ſo far from being applicable to the ſame individual, are contraſted, as repreſenting perſons of oppoſite characters. Yet the article, as well as the adjective πας, are omitted before the ſecond participle: but every body muſt be ſenſible that they are underſtood as equally belonging to both. The caſe of the paſſage under review is ſimilar. Εξισταντο δε παντες οι ακουοντες αυτα, επι τη συνεσει και ταις αποκρισεσιν αυτα, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν. Here the παντες οι may be underſtood as repeated before the ſecond participle. An inconſiderable alteration in the arrangement of the words, will make this criticiſm be more ſenſibly felt. Παντες δε οι ακουοντες αυτα εξισαντο, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν, επι τη συνεσει και ταις αποκρισεσιν αυτα. For the ſake of perſpicuity, I have followed this order in the verſion. But as the words are capable of the other interpretation abovementioned, my reaſons for preferring that here given, are theſe: 1ſt, In the ordinary explanation, the diſtance is rather too great between the participle in v. 48. and the nouns to which it refers in v. 43. This has made Be. think it neceſſary to ſupply the words *parentes ejus,* for removing the obſcurity; and in this he has been followed by ſeveral other interpreters. 2dly, The meaning, here given, appears to me better ſuited to the ſcope of the paſſage. His parents may be ſaid to have had reaſon of ſurpriſe, or even amazement, when they diſcovered that he was not in their company; but ſurely, to them at leaſt, there was nothing peculiarly ſurpriſing, in finding that he was not amuſing himſelf with boys, but in the temple, among the doctors, diſcourſing on the moſt important ſubjects. I may ſay juſtly that, to them, who knew whence he was, there was leſs ground of amazement at the wiſdom and underſtanding diſplayed in his anſwers, than to any other human being. 3dly, It appears the intention of the Evangeliſt, in this paſſage, to impreſs us with a ſenſe of the extraordinary attainments of our Lord, in wiſdom and knowledge, even in childhood, from the effect which the diſcovery of them produced on others. All in the temple who, though they did not ſee him, were within hearing, and

could judge from what they heard, were aſtoniſhed at the propriety, the penetration, and the energy, they diſcovered in every thing he ſaid; but thoſe whoſe eyeſight convinced them of his tender age, were confounded, as perſons who were witneſſes of ſomething preternatural.

49. *At my Father's*, εν τοις του πατρος μου. E. T. *About my Father's buſineſs*. Sy. רבית אבי *in domo patres mei*. The Arm. verſion renders the words in the ſame manner. It has been juſtly obſerved, that τα του ἰδιου is a Gr. idiom, not only with claſſical writers, but with the ſacred penmen, for denoting the houſe of ſuch a perſon. Thus, Eſther, vii. 9. what is in Heb. בבית המן and in the E. T. *In the houſe of Haman*, is rendered by the Seventy, εν τοις Αμαν. Εις τα ἰδια, J. xix. 27. is juſtly tranſlated, in the common verſion (and, I may add, to the ſame purpoſe, in every verſion I know), *To his own home*. The idiom and ellipſis are the ſame. The like examples occur, Eſth. v. 10. vi. 12. One who deſires to ſee more, may conſult Wet. upon the place. This interpretation has been given by many great ſcriptural critics, ancient and modern, Origen, Euth. The. Gro. Ham. Wet. and others. As the phraſe is elliptical in Gr. I have, with Dod. expreſſed it elliptically in Eng. It is not often that our language admits ſo cloſe a reſemblance.

CHAP. III.

1. *Procurator*. Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 17.

2. *In the high prieſthood of Annas and Caiaphas*, επ' αρχιερεως Αννα και Καϊαφα. By the original conſtitution, one only could be high prieſt at one time, and the office was for life. But after the nation had fallen under the power of foreigners, great liberties were taken with this ſacred office; and high prieſts, though ſtill of the pontifical family of Aaron, were put in or out arbitrarily, as ſuited the humour, the intereſt, or the political views of their rulers. And though it does not appear that they ever appointed two to officiate jointly in that ſtation, there is ſome probability that the Romans, about this time, made the office annual, and that Annas and Caiaphas enjoyed it by turns. See J. xi. 49. xviii. 3. Acts iv. 6. If this was the caſe, which is not unlikely; or if, as ſome think, the *ſagan*, or deputy, is comprehended under the ſame title, we cannot juſtly be ſurpriſed that they ſhould be named as colleagues by the Evangeliſt. In any event it may have been uſual, through courteſy, to continue to give the title to thoſe who had ever enjoyed that dignity, which, when they had no king, was the greateſt in the nation. It is not improper to add, that a very great number of MSS. many of them of the higheſt value, read αρχιερεως, in the ſingular. Though this reading does not well ſuit the ſyntactic order, and though it is not favoured by any ancient verſion, except the Cop. it is approved by Wet.

13. *Exact no more*, μηδεν πλεον πραττετε. Vul. *Nihil amplius faciatis*. Er. *Ne quid amplius exigatis*. In this Er. who has been followed by Leo, Caſ. Be. the Eng. and other modern tranſlators, has, without departing from the known meaning of the Gr. verb, given a verſion that is both appoſite and perſpicuous. We cannot ſay ſo much of the paſſage, as tranſlated in the Vul.

18. *And, with many other exhortations, he publiſhed the good tidings to the people*. Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 4.

19. *His brother's wife*, της γυναικος Φιλιππου του αδελφου αυτου. The word Φιλιππου is wanting in very many MSS. both of great and of little account. It is not in ſome of the oldeſt and beſt editions, nor in the Vul. Arm. Go. and Sax. verſions. It is, beſides, rejected by Mill and Wet. The latter obſerves, that the name is rightly omitted here, as otherwiſe the perſon meant might readily be miſtaken for the Philip mentioned v. 1. This conſideration adds to the probability that he has not been named in this place, becauſe, if the Evangeliſt had named him, it is natural to think, that he would have added ſome circumſtance to diſcriminate him from the Philip he had mentioned ſo ſhort while before.

23. *Now Jeſus was himſelf about thirty years in ſubjection*, και αυτος ην ὁ Ιησους ὡσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος. E. T. *And Jeſus himſelf began to be about thirty years of age*. Nothing, I think, is plainer than that, by no rule of ſyntax, can the Gr. words be ſo conſtrued, as to yield the ſenſe which our tranſlators have given them. Admitting that ην αρχομενος may be uſed for ηρχετο; becauſe, though the phraſe does not occur in Scripture, it is not unconformable to the Gr. idiom; yet if αρχομενος mean, here, *beginning*, ſomething ſtill is wanting to complete the ſenſe. Some, therefore, to fill up the deficiency, join the word ων, immediately following, to this clauſe, and, by an extraordinary *enallagé*, cauſe the participle to ſupply the place of the infinitive. Thus, they make the Evangeliſt ſay, ην αρχομενος ων, for ηρχετο ειναι. As if we ſhould ſay, in Eng. *And he was beginning being*, inſtead of, *And he began to be*; for the expreſſion, in the one language, is no way preferable to that in the other. Thoſe who imagine that, in ſo plain a caſe, the Evangeliſt would have expreſſed himſelf in ſo obſcure, ſo perplexed, and ſo unnatural, a manner, have a notion very different from mine, of the ſimplicity of ſtyle employed by theſe writers. Beſides, ſome critics have juſtly remarked, that there is an incongruity in ſaying, in any language, A man *began to be about* ſuch an age. When we ſay, a man is about ſuch an age, we are always underſtood to denote, that we cannot ſay whether he be exactly ſo, or a little more, or a little leſs; but this will never ſuit the expreſſion, *began to be*, which admits no ſo ſuch latitude. To combine, in this manner, a definite with an indefinite term, confounds the

meaning, and leaves the reader entirely at a loss. Some interpret the words, When he was about thirty years old, he began his miniſtry. But as there is no mention of miniſtry, or alluſion to it, either in what goes before, or in what follows, I ſuſpect this mode of expreſſion would be equally unprecedented with the former. The whole difficulty is removed at once, by making the import of the participle the ſame with that of ὑποτασσομενος, ch. ii. 51. *ruled, governed, in ſubjection.* Hey. has adopted this method, which was, he ſays, ſuggeſted by a remark he found in the book called *A Critical Examination of the holy Goſpels.* In this way underſtood, we find no more occaſion to do violence to the conſtruction; every thing like ellipſis, or tautology, or incongruous combination, vaniſhes at once. Beſides, the meaning given is entirely analogical, and not unfrequent; αρχειν, in the active voice, is *to govern,* αρχεσθαι, in the paſſive, *to be governed.* Juſt ſo, αρχοντες και αρχομενοι, *magiſtrates and ſubjects.* Τας νυκτος προσκοπει, τι σοι ποιησουσιν οι αρχομενοι, οταιδαν ἡμερα γενηται: *At night, provide work for your ſubjects to do when it is day.* Cyropæd. lib. i. No critic heſitates to admit even an uncommon acceptation, when it is the only acceptation which ſuits the words connected. Who queſtions the propriety of rendering πρασσειν, v. 13. *to exact?* Yet, though this verb occurs in the N. T. upwards of thirty times, the verſe mentioned is the only place wherein it can be ſo rendered. The argument is ſtronger in the preſent caſe, as, by the meaning given, which is far from being uncommon, the conſtruction alſo is unravelled.

23. *As was ſuppoſed,* ως ενομιζετο. Vul. Er. Zu. Caſ. *Ut putabatur.* Sy. to the ſame purpoſe, משתבר Hey. *As was ſuppoſed according to law.* Prieſtley's Harmony, *As he was by law allowed to be.* In this he has adopted the explanation given by biſhop Pearce, in his commentary and notes. I am not againſt preferring a leſs to a more uſual interpretation, when the former ſuits the ſcope of the paſſage, and the latter does not. But, in the preſent inſtance, nothing can ſuit better the ſcope of the paſſage, than the common acceptation of the verb νομιζεσθαι, which is, *to be thought, ſuppoſed,* or *accounted.* The hiſtorian had, in the two preceding chapters, given us an account of our Lord's miraculous conception by the power of the Holy Spirit in the womb of a virgin. After having ſaid ſo much to ſatisfy us that Jeſus was no ſon of Joſeph, and now introducing the mention of him as his ſon, it was quite natural to inſert the clauſe, ως ενομιζετο, to ſhow that, in this, he did not contradict himſelf, but ſpoke, only according to the current, though miſtaken, opinion of the country. But what the words, *allowed by law,* have to do here, it would not be eaſy to conceive. One would imagine, from them, that a claim of ſucceſſion to Joſeph had been made on the part of Jeſus, and oppoſed by the relations, but carried in a court of law. This is one of thoſe refinements in criticiſm, which make men nauſeate what is obvious, and purſue, through the mazes of etymology, what was never imagined before. Be. who, as has been obſerved, often errs in this way, has not diſcovered, here, any ſcope for the indulgence of his favourite humour, but, like others, has rendered the words, ſimply, *ut exiſtimabatur.* As to the quotations from Joſephus, there is nothing parallel in the caſes: beſides, it will readily be admitted, by critics, that the words, ευχας νενομισμενας, are better rendered *the cuſtomary prayers,* than *the prayers appointed by law.* The paſſive νομιζεσθαι frequently correſponds to the La. *moris eſſe:* whereas, the proper expreſſion, in Gr. for *prayers appointed by law,* is ευχας νομιμους. The examples from claſſical authors, referred to in Wet. are all capable of being rendered by one or other of the two ordinary ſignifications, *to be thought,* or *to be wont.* But, in ſuch phraſes as ὡς ενομιζετο, there is commonly a meaning appropriated, by uſe, to the words, taken jointly, from which there will not, perhaps, be found a ſingle exception. Had it, therefore, been the ſacred writer's intention to ſay what thoſe interpreters would make him ſay, he would certainly have choſen another expreſſion for conveying his ſentiment than this, which, he muſt have been ſenſible, could not be underſtood otherwiſe than as it has always, till ſo late as the eighteenth century, been interpreted; for, let it be obſerved, that this is one of the paſſages in which there was never diſcovered, by either commentators or interpreters, the ſhadow of a difficulty, and about which there was never before any difference of opinion or doubt.

36. *Son of Cainan.* Be. on the ſingle authority of the Cam. in oppoſition to the united teſtimonies of MSS. and tranſlations, has omitted this clauſe in his verſion. *Cainan* is not indeed in the Heb. genealogy of Abraham, Gen. xi. 12, 13. either in the Jewiſh copy or in the Samaritan, though it is in the verſion of the Seventy. But this is not the only place in which this Evangeliſt, who wrote in Gr. followed the old Gr. tranſlation, even where it differed from the original Heb. But it is not the province of a tranſlator of the Goſpel, becauſe he eſteems the Heb. reading preferable to the Gr. to correct, by his own ideas what he has reaſon to believe was written by the Evangeliſt.

CHAP. IV.

2. *The devil.* Diſſ. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

7. *It ſhall all be thine,* εαν ουν προσκυνησης. In the much greater number of MSS. eſpecially thoſe of principal note, for προσκυνησης we read προσκυνησῃς, agreeing with εξουσια. Both the Sy. the Cop. the Eth. and the Ara. verſions, have read in the ſame manner. But the Vul. has *omnia.* Of printed editions, the Com. two of Stephens, Wechelius, Ben. Wet. Bowyer, read alſo προσκυνησῃς.

8. Υπαγε

8. Ὑπαγε οπισω μου Σατανα. This clauſe is not only wanting in ſome of the beſt MSS. but in the Sy. Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. and Eth. tranſlations. Gro. obſerves, that before The. no ancient writer conſidered theſe words as belonging to this place. Mill agrees with Gro. in rejecting them. Wet. who is more ſcrupulous, chuſes to retain them, though he rejects the particle γαρ immediately following, to which the introduction of this clauſe has probably given riſe.

18. *Inaſmuch as,* ὁ ἐστιν. E. T. *Becauſe.* Vul. *Propter quod.* Caſ. *Quandoquidem.* Dod. and others, *For the purpoſe to which.* The force of the conjunction is better hit by Caſ. than either by the E. T. or by the Vul. and Dod. It is neither cauſal nor final ſo much as explanatory. Such is often the import of the Heb. יען *iaghan*, the word uſed by the prophet.

18, 19. Diſſ. V. P. II. § 2. Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 5.

19. The Vul. without the authority of MSS. adds to this verſe, *et diem retributionis;* and in this is followed by the ſecond Sy. Ara. Arm. and Sax. verſions. A clauſe correſponding to it is indeed found in the prophet quoted; but in no Gr. MS. of L. except in a few belonging to the Marquis de los Veles, which, in Si.'s opinion, have been fabricated on the Vul. and are conſequently of no authority in this queſtion.

20. *To the ſervant,* τω ὑπηρετῃ. E. T. *To the miniſter.* From the manner in which we apply the word *miniſter*, in ſpeaking of our churches, the Eng. reader is apt to be led into a miſtake by the common verſion, and to conſider the word here as meaning the perſon who preſided in the ſervice; whereas, it denotes only a ſubordinate officer, who attended the miniſter, and obeyed his orders in what concerned the more ſervile part of the work. Amongſt other things, he had the charge of the ſacred books, and delivered them to thoſe to whom he was commanded by his ſuperiors to give them. After the reading was over, he depoſited them in their proper place.

22. *All expreſſed their admiration of him,* παντες εμαρτυρουν αυτω. E. T. *All bare him witneſs.* Μαρτυρειν τινι commonly denotes, *to give one a favourable teſtimony; to praiſe, to commend;* as ch. xi. 48. Acts xiii. 22. Rom. x. 2. Here it is manifeſtly uſed in this ſenſe. The phraſe *bare him witneſs*, is both indefinite and obſcure.

22. *Words full of grace,* τοις λογοις της χαριτος. E. T. *The gracious words.* Dod. *The graceful words.* I took notice, on ch. ii. 40. that *gracious*, which is nearly ſynonymous to *kind*, does not ſuit the ſenſe of this paſſage. I muſt ſay the ſame thing of *graceful*, which though one who judged from etymology, would think perfectly equivalent to *full of grace*, is not ſo in reality. *Graceful* words means, in approved uſe, no more than *well-ſounding* words; whereas in *words full of grace*, if I miſtake not, there is always ſomething implied in relation to their ſenſe much more than to their ſound.

34. *The holy One of God,* ὁ ἁγιος του Θεου. For the full import of the word ἁγιος, in its different applications, ſee Diſſ. VI. P. IV. It may be proper here, however, to remark, that when the word is uſed in the N. T. as an appellative with the article, in the ſingular number, and applied to a perſon, the application is always either to God or to Chriſt. Let it be obſerved, that I do not ſpeak of the Heb. חזר *chaſi*, and the Gr. ὁσιος, but of קדש *kadoſh* and ἁγιος. This term is employed ſometimes alone, to denote the true God, ὁ ἁγιος the holy One, and ſometimes, particularly in the O. T. with the addition of the name of his people, *the holy One of Iſrael.* Ὁ ἁγιος *the holy One*, or *the ſaint*, is, in like manner, appropriated, particularly in the N. T. to Jeſus Chriſt, commonly with the addition of του Θεου. But, after the times of the Apoſtles, Chriſtians became much more laviſh of titles, and of this title in particular, than their predeceſſors had been. I have, therefore, choſen to follow our tranſlators in rendering ὁ ἁγιος *the holy One*, rather than *the Saint*, a denomination which, in latter ages, has been ſo much proſtituted, that, to ſay the leaſt, a name ſo venerable, as that of Jeſus, could derive no dignity from it.

36. *What meaneth this, that with authority and power he commandeth?* τις ὁ λογος ουτος, ὁτι εν εξουσια και δυναμει επιτασσει; E. T. *What a word is this? For with authority and power he commandeth.* For the import of the conjunction ὁτι, in this place, ſee ch. i. 45. [20] N.

39. *Standing near her,* επιστας επανω αυτης. E. T. *He ſtood over her.* Επανω, in the ſacred penmen, frequently anſwers to the Heb. על *ghal*, which correſponds not only to the La. prepoſition *ſuper*, but to *juxta*.

40. *After ſunſet, all they who had any ſick*—becauſe then the Sabbath was ended, and the people were at liberty to carry their ſick.

41. *Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God,* συ ει ὁ Χριστος ὁ υιος του Θεου. Vul. *Tu es filius Dei,* Ὁ Χριστος is not in the Cam. and four other MSS. It has no place in the Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. verſions, any more than in the Vul.

[20] *Would not allow them to ſpeak becauſe they knew,* και ειασε αυτα λαλειν, ὁτι ηδεισαν. Some think, that the words may be rendered, *Would not allow them to ſay that they knew*, interpreting the conjunction ὁτι as in verſe 36. Had the Evangeliſt uſed λεγειν inſtead of λαλειν, I ſhould certainly have ſo tranſlated the paſſage; but as theſe two verbs are not employed promiſcuouſly in Gr. I thought it better to preſerve the diſtinction in Eng.

42. *Sought*

42. *Sought him out*, εζητουν αυτον. E. T. *Sought him.* A very great number of MSS. and among theſe ſome of the moſt valuable, read επεζητουν. The difference in meaning is not conſiderable; but it is ſufficient to warrant the diſtinction here made.

1. *Urged him not to leave them*, κατειχον αυτον του μη πορευεσθαι απ' αυτων. E. T. *Stayed him that he ſhould not depart from them.* In moſt tranſlations, as well as in the Eng. the words are ſo rendered as to imply that they detained him by force. But that κατεχω does not always ſignify the poſſeſſion or the attainment of the thing ſpoken of, is evident from this very writer's uſe of it, Acts xxvii. 40. κατειχεν εις τον αιγιαλον, which our tranſlators render, very juſtly, *made toward ſhore.* Here the verb expreſſes no more than the earneſtneſs of their endeavours.

CHAP. V.

2. *Aground near the edge*, ἑστωτα παρα την λιμνην. E. T. *Standing by the lake.* The word ἑστως, applied to a ſhip or boat, means either being *at anchor*, or being *aground.* The latter ſeems here the more probable meaning, for the following reaſons: Firſt, the πλοια, ſo often mentioned in the Goſpel, though in the common verſion rendered *ſhips*, were, in reality (if we may judge from the account given of them by Joſephus, who had good occaſion to know, having had for ſome time the chief command in Galilee), but a ſort of large fiſhing boats. What we are told, v. 7. that the fiſhes taken filled both the veſſels, inſomuch that they were ſinking, is a ſtrong confirmation of what we learn from him concerning their ſize. I have, therefore, in this and other places, after the tranſlators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. L. Cl. and other Fr. interpreters, rendered the word *barks*, diſtinguiſhing the diminutive πλοιαρια by tranſlating it *boats.* Even the largeſt of ſuch veſſels might eaſily be run aground or ſet afloat, as occaſion required. Joſephus calls them σκαφη, reckons about two hundred and thirty of them on the lake, and four or five men to each. Another reaſon for thinking that the word ἑστωτα here means rather *aground* than *at anchor*, is, becauſe they are ſaid to be, not εν τη λιμνη, but παρα την λιμνην. It is the ſame expreſſion which is uſed in the preceding verſe, concerning our Lord himſelf, and which, by conſequence, muſt mean beſide the water, rather than in it. Thirdly, Our Lord's deſire, expreſſed in the third verſe, to put off a little from the land, when his ſole purpoſe was to teach the people, ſhows that they were ſo cloſe upon the multitude as to be incommoded by them. This is alſo another evidence of the ſmallneſs of the veſſels.

7. *So that they were near ſinking*, ὡστε βυθιζεσθαι αυτα. E. T. *So that they began to ſink.* Vul. *Ita ut pænè mergerentur.* The Sy. verſion is conformable to the Vul. Common ſenſe indeed ſhows, that βυθιζεσθαι cannot here be rigidly interpreted. In familiar language, words are often uſed with equal latitude.

9. *For the draught of fiſhes which they had taken, had filled him and all his companions with terror*, θαμβος γαρ περιεσχεν αυτον και παντας τους συν αυτω, επι τη αγρα των ιχθυων ἡ συνελαβον. E. T. *For he was aſtoniſhed and all that were with him, at the draught of the fiſhes which they had taken.* The word *aſtoniſhed*, in the common verſion, is far too weak for expreſſing the effect which we find this miracle produced upon Peter, and which evidently had in it more of *terror* than of *aſtoniſhment.* I have, in verſe 8th, varied from my ordinary method, and rendered Κυριε *Lord*, though addreſſed to Jeſus before his reſurrection. I think the manner in which Peter appears to have been affected, and the extraordinary petition he preſented to a perſon of whoſe benevolence and humanity he had been ſo oft a witneſs, will juſtify this alteration, as they clearly ſhow that he diſcovered in his Maſter, on this occaſion, ſomething ſuperior to human, which quite overwhelmed him with awe and fear.

10. *Thou ſhalt catch men*, ανθρωπους εση ζωγρων. Dod. *Thou ſhalt captivate men.* But *captivate* is never applied to *fiſhes.* Conſequently, by this rendering, the trope is deſtroyed; for ζωγρεω is equally applicable to both. Beſides, *to catch* expreſſes no more than an effect; and does not, of itſelf, imply any artifice in the means; juſt ſo ζωγρεω expreſſes the effect, without either implying or excluding artifice.

26. *Incredible things*, παραδοξα. E. T. *Strange things.* This expreſſion is rather feeble. Vul. *Mirabilia.* Er. Zu. Caſ. *Incredibilia.* Be. *Inopinata.* The import of the Gr. word is better hit by Er. Zu. and Caſ. than by either of the other La. tranſlators. The word uſed by Be. appears at firſt to be the moſt exact, becauſe moſt conformable to etymology, παρα την δοξαν, but is in fact the weakeſt of all, for *inopinatus*, is no more than *unexpected*: now, to ſay a thing is unexpected, is not ſaying ſo much as it is *ſtrange.* It may be obſerved in paſſing, that the term occurs in no other place of the N. T. and is not found in the verſion of the Seventy.

CHAP. VI.

1. *On the Sabbath called ſecond-prime*, εν Σαββατω δευτεροπρωτω. E. T. *On the ſecond Sabbath after the firſt.* Vul. Er. Zu. Caſ. *Sabbato Secundo primo.* Among the different explanations which are given of the term δευτεροπρωτος I find nothing but conjecture, and therefore think it the ſafeſt way to render the word by one ſimilarly formed in our language. This is what all the beſt tranſlators have done in La. In the Sy. there is no word anſwering to it. The common verſion has, in this inſtance, neither followed the letter nor given us words which convey any determinate ſenſe.

7. *Watched*, παρετηρουν αυτον. E. T. *Watched him.* But αυτον is wanting in a very great number of MSS. the Al. and ſome others of principal note, in ſeveral

ſeveral of the beſt editions, in the Vul. Go. and Sax. verſions, &c. It is rejected both by Mill and by Wet.

9. *I would aſk you, What is it lawful to do on the Sabbath? Good or ill?* Επερωτησω υμας τι εξεστι τοις Σαββασιν αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι; E. T. *I will aſk you one thing, Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good, or to do evil?* but a great many MSS. and printed editions, read the ſentence as pointed in this manner, Επερωτησω υμας· Τι εξεστι τοις Σαββασιν; αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι; which, without any alteration on the words or letters, yields the ſenſe here expreſſed. I have had occaſion to obſerve that, in regard to the pointing, it cannot be denied that the critic is entitled to greater freedom of conjecture than in what concerns the words themſelves. To ſhow, however, that this manner of diſtinguiſhing the clauſes is very ancient, it is proper to obſerve that both the Sy. verſions and the Go. are made from the ſentence divided in the manner juſt now exhibited. As to the import of the queſtion it contains, ſee Mr. iii. 4. N.

12. *In an oratory,* εν τη προσευχη του Θεου. E. T. *In prayer to God.* It is plain that, by the known rules of conſtruction, the words do not admit this interpretation. The common ſignification of προσευχη is indeed *prayer;* but both προσευχη and δεησις, a term of nearly the ſame import, are always, in the N. T. conſtrued with the prepoſition προς before the object addreſſed. See Acts xii. 5. Rom x. 1. xv. 30. Heb. v. 7. And when either term is followed by the genitive of a word, denoting a perſon, it is invariably the perſon praying, not the perſon prayed to. See Jam. v. 16. Rev. v. 8. viii. 3. Though the words occur in the Sep. and in the N. T. times without number, the genitive is not, in a ſingle inſtance, employed to denote the being to whom ſupplication is made. Such a mode of interpreting would be ſubverſive of the analogy of the language. The only way of avoiding this error here is by aſſigning another meaning to the word προσευχη, and tranſlating it *a houſe,* or *place of prayer, an oratory.* That there is undoubted authority for this meaning of the word, is ſhown by the examples produced by Wet. from Philo, Joſephus, and others. L. uſes it again in the ſame ſenſe, Acts xvi. 13. 16. As the word, thus applied, peculiarly regarded the Jewiſh worſhip, it was as much appropriated as the word συναγωγη. In this acceptation, La. writers transferred it into their language. That line of Juvenal is well known, Sat. III.

" Ede ubi conſiſtas, in qua te quæro proſeucha."

Now, when the meaning is a houſe of prayer, the expreſſion η προσευχη του Θεου is analogous to ο οικος του Θεου, *the houſe of God,* and το ιερον του Θεου, *the temple of God.* The definite article η prefixed, though proper in the hiſtorian, ſpeaking of a place known to thoſe to whom his hiſtory was immediately addreſſed (for we generally ſay the church, where there is but one church) it is not neceſſary in a tranſlator to retain; for, to his readers, ſuch circumſtances muſt rather appear indefinite. The addition of του Θεου was neceſſary in Gr. to prevent ambiguity, its import is implied in the word *oratory* in Eng.

15. *Called the zealous,* τον καλουμενον ζηλωτην. E. T. *Called zelotes.* As the Sy. word *Cananite,* uſed in the parallel place in Mt. is ſuſceptible of the ſame interpretation with the Gr. word uſed here, which may be underſtood either as an epithet or as a ſurname; and as it was not uncommon, in writing Gr. to tranſlate the Oriental names by a word of the ſame import (thus Cephas is tranſlated *Peter,* Thomas *Didimus,* Tabitha *Dorcas);* it is very probable that this has happened in the preſent caſe. It is the more ſo, as there was, about that time, a party in Paleſtine, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the title ζηλωται, and who though, perhaps, actuated by a pious intention in the beginning, ſoon degenerated, and became, at laſt, the greateſt ſcourge of their country, and the immediate cauſe of its ruin. But, at the time referred to by the Evangeliſt, as they had not perpetrated thoſe crimes with which they are charged by the hiſtorian, nay, were favoured by the people as patriots, and men who burnt with zeal for religion; I thought it better to render ζηλωτην here *the zealous,* according to the meaning of the word; as it appears to have been the intention of the writer to acquaint us that this Simon had belonged formerly to the party ſo denominated. I have ſaid *the zealous,* rather than *the zealot,* as this laſt term is never uſed by us but in a bad ſenſe. And though indeed, the atrocious actions of the ζηλωται brought at laſt the very name into diſgrace, there is no reaſon to think that the mention of it here carries any unfavourable inſinuation along with it. Mat. x. 4. N.

22. *Exclude you from their ſociety,* αφορισωσι υμας, that is, *Expel you from the ſynagogue, excommunicate you.*

22. *Deſame you,* εκβαλωσι το ονομα υμων ως πονηρον. E. T. *Caſt out your name as evil.* L. Cl. Beau. *Vous deffamera.* Theſe Fr. tranſlators have, in my opinion, expreſſed the full import of this clauſe. The phraſe רוע שם *hotſia ſhem raang,* Deut. xxii. 19. (which correſponds to the Gr. expreſſion above quoted) is a Heb. circumlocution for *defaming,* or raiſing and propagating an evil and falſe report. This interpretation, beſide being more perſpicuous, makes the words exactly coincide in ſenſe with the parallel paſſage, Mr. v. 11. Now there is ground to think that the ſentiment conveyed in both places is the ſame. For whether the Evangeliſts have given us two diſcourſes, delivered at different times, or accounts a little diverſified of the ſame diſcourſe, the general coincidence of the ſentiments is evident. It may be objected to the interpretation here given, that there is, in one point, a diſſimilarity in the expreſſion uſed by Matthew and that

C employed

employed by L. there being nothing in the Heb. corresponding to the Gr. ὅτι. But a small difference in the application of the phrases accounts entirely for this variation. In the passage quoted from the Pentateuch, there is no occasion for a pronoun; the expression is general and indefinite, *Because he hath brought up* (strictly, *set forth*) *an evil name on a virgin of Israel.* In the Gr. of the Evangelist, the expression is definite and particular, being specially addressed to the hearers, and therefore conjoined with the pronoun of the second person. It is not ονομα, but το ονομα ὑμων, not *a name* in general, but *your name* in particular. If, therefore, πονηρον had followed without the ὡς there would have been an implicit acknowledgment of the truth of the scandal, and their enemies would have been charged only with publishing it. As it stands, it entirely corresponds to the expression in Mt. *Accuse you falsely of every evil thing.*

24, 25, 26. *Wo unto you*—Ουαι ὑμιν. The form of expression in both languages, in these verses, so much coincides with what we are rarely accustomed to hear, except in passionate imprecations, that it is no wonder they should be, in some measure, misunderstood by the majority of readers. That such words were often directed against those who were not only bad men, but the avowed enemies of our Lord, is a circumstance which heightens this appearance of imprecation, and renders it difficult for us to conceive otherwise of the expressions. Some have called them authoritative denunciations of judgments; but this, I am afraid, is but a softer way of expressing the same thing. Our Lord is not here acting in the character of judge pronouncing sentence on the guilty, or dooming them to punishment. The office of judge is part of that glory to which he was not to be exalted till after his humiliation and sufferings. But he speaks here, in my apprehension, purely in the character of prophet, or teacher, divinely enlightened as to the consequences of men's actions, and whose zeal for their good obliged him to give them warning. But that this explanation may not appear merely conjectural, let the following considerations, for ascertaining the import of the interjection, be impartially attended to. The only satisfactory evidence, in such cases, is the actual application of the word. Now, as to its application in the instances before us, there are four classes against whom *woe* is pronounced. These are: —*the rich,* —*they that are full,* —*they who laugh,* —*they of whom men speak well.* Now, that we may apprehend more exactly the view with which they were uttered, let us consider the four classes (for they also are four), in verses 20, 21, and 22. which are with like solemnity, pronounced happy. These are: —*the poor,* —*they that hunger,* —*they that weep,* —*they of whom men speak ill.* No one can be at a loss to perceive that these are manifestly and intentionally contrasted; the characters in the former class being no other than those of the latter reversed. And if so, by all the rules of interpretation, the mood or form of the sentence must be the same in both. Now as these Μακαριοι οι πτωχοι, κ. τ. λ. have ever been considered as declarative, and not as expressing a prayer or wish; the other must be understood in the same manner. The substantive verb, therefore, to be supplied (for in both cases it is, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom, wanting in the original), is in the indicative, and not in the optative or the imperative. *Woe is unto you,* not *woe be unto you.* *Vox est,* says Gro. *dolentis, non irâ incensi.* Again, let us consider a little the expression, Mt. xxiv. 19. in our Lord's prediction of the calamities coming on Jerusalem and the Jewish nation: Ουαι ταις εν γαστρι εχουσαις, και ταις θηλαζουσαις εν εκειναις ταις ἡμεραις: *Woe to the women with child, and to them that give suck in those days.* As nobody can be so foolish as to imagine that either pregnancy, or the suckling of children, are here exhibited as criminal; to understand this otherwise than as a declaration of the unhappiness of women in these circumstances, at such a time of general calamity, were absurd in an uncommon degree. The parallel passage in L. xxiii. 29. where we have the same prophecy, would remove every shadow of doubt as to the meaning, if it were possible that, to the attentive and judicious, there could be any: *The days are coming wherein they shall say, Happy the barren, the wombs which never bare, and the breasts which never gave suck.* That these words are declarative, is what no person ever called in question. If we recur to the O. T. we have the clearest proofs that the word in Heb. rendered και in the Sep. is commonly employed to express not wrath and execration, but the deepest concern and lamentation. Accordingly we find, in several instances, the word construed with the pronoun of the first person, και ἡμιν, and και μοι, *woe unto us,* and *woe unto me*; in which cases, to avoid ambiguity, our translators might have said always, as they have done in some places, *woe is us,* and *woe is me,* which, though perhaps too familiar for the solemn style of Scripture, exactly hits the sense of the original. But in those places, it must be owned, nobody seems to have mistaken the words for an imprecation. See 1 Sam. iv. 7, 8. Jer. iv. 13. vi. 4. Lam. v. 16. both in the Sep. and in the E. T. In fine, as *the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; he came* not to curse, but *to bless us, by turning away every one of us from his iniquities.* The words which proceeded out of his mouth were, in every sense, justly denominated *full of grace.* His example was perfectly conformable to his instructions; and I will venture to affirm that, the more narrowly we examine his discourses, the more we shall be convinced, that nothing he ever uttered against any living being, if candidly interpreted, will be found to bear any the least affinity to an imprecation. Wa. in his translation of Mt. renders και, ch. xi. 21. and in other places, *alas!* Thus: Ουαι σοι Κοραζιν is, with him, *Alas! for thee, Chorazin!* But though he has so far hit the sense, in making this particle an interjection of pity and grief, not of anger or resentment, there is a feebleness in the expression which ill befits the importance of the occasion. It would suit well enough for express-

ing

ing a tranſient regret on account of ſome trifling accident; but ſo ſlight an indication of ſorrow, in a matter of ſuch ineffable conſequence as that which affects men's eternal intereſts, has a worſe effect, and looks more like inſenſibility, than the abſence of every outward indication. The common rendering has this advantage, that it repreſents the ſubject as ſerious, yea, momentous: and as the uſe of the idiom, in other places of the E. T. as well as in the original, puts it beyond all doubt, that it is often the voice of lamentation, and not of wrath, I thought it, on the whole, better to retain it; and, for removing every appearance of ambiguity, to give this explanation in a note.

26. *When man ſhall ſpeak well of you,* ὁταν καλως ὑμας ειπωσι παντες οι ανθρωποι. The word παντες is wanting in many MSS. ſome of them of principal note; and alſo in the Sy. Vul. Eth. and Ara. verſions, as well as in ſeveral of the beſt editions and ancient commentators. Mill and Wet. both reject it.

35. *Nowiſe deſpairing,* μηδεν απελπιζοντες. E. T. *Hoping for nothing again.* Vul. Er. Zu. Caſ. Be. *Nihil inde ſperantes.* Such a concurrence, in the La. interpreters, has enſured, as might have been expected, the imitation of all the firſt tranſlators into modern European tongues; inſomuch that this interpretation ſeems to have become, till of late, univerſal in the Weſt. But from this the Sy. and Oriental verſions differ conſiderably. I agree with Wet. and others, in rejecting it, becauſe I ſee no reaſon for thinking that απελπιζειν has ever, either in claſſical writers, or in ſacred, any ſuch meaning. This, indeed, is the only place in the N. T. where it occurs. The paſſive participle απηλπισμενος, is found once in the Sep. Iſ. xxix. 19. anſwering to a word ſignifying *indigent*, or, as we ſhould ſay, *hopeleſs*. It is uſed, in the ſame ſenſe, Judith ix. 11. The verb απελπιζειν occurs in three other places of the Apocryphal writings, but in none of them is ſuſceptible of any other interpretation than to loſe hope, to deſpond. This is alſo the claſſical ſenſe of the word. The only reaſon I can diſcover, which has induced expoſitors to give it a contrary meaning, and to make it ſignify *to hope for ſomething back*, ſeems to have been the notion that the verſe, thus interpreted, makes the beſt contraſt to the preceding words, *If ye lend to thoſe only from whom ye hope to receive*—— I acknowledge that, in the common verſion, there is the appearance of a ſtronger contraſt, than in the tranſlation which I have given; but if it were ſo, this is not a ſufficient reaſon for affixing a meaning to the word ſo unprecedented, eſpecially, when its ordinary acceptation ſuits the ſcope of the paſſage. Beſides, the contraſt, I ſuſpect, is not ſo pointed as ſome imagine. *From whom ye hope to receive*, does not, in my notion, ſuggeſt the reſtoration of the loan, but the like good office in return. It is as if he had ſaid, 'If ye lend to thoſe only from 'whom ye yourſelves may have occaſion to borrow,——' for this, it muſt be owned, is merely a ſelfiſh intercourſe. But the very term, *to lend*, implies the ſtipulation of the return of what is lent (otherwiſe it would not be called *lent*, but *given*): nor does this ſtipulation annihilate the humanity of the action in lending money, eſpecially to a very poor man, ſince the lender gratuitouſly gives the borrower the uſe of his property, while he himſelf runs the hazard of the loſs. Let it be obſerved that, by lending I do not mean, here, putting out money at intereſt; for this is an affair merely commercial, and comes not, unleſs in particular circumſtances, under the claſs of good offices. Now, had the verb απελπιζω been capable of the meaning which thoſe interpreters aſſign to it, it would have been more appoſite to ſubjoin μηδεν απελπιζοντες immediately after αγαθοποιειτε, leaving out και δανειζετε altogether, for this rather hurts the ſenſe. Again, there are ſome who, ſenſible that απελπιζω does not admit the interpretation which the Vul. has given it, and that its ordinary meaning is *to deſpair*, think that, by a ſort of Hebraiſm, it may be interpreted, here, actively, to cauſe to deſpair. Theſe make a ſmall alteration on the preceding word, ſaying, μηδενα (not μηδεν) απελπιζοντες, *cauſing none to deſpair*, to wit, of relief when in ſtraits. This gives a good ſenſe, and not unſuitable to the ſcope of the context. But though ſome neuter verbs are, in the Helleniſtic idiom, ſometimes active, expreſſing the force of the Heb. conjugation *hiphil*, we have no evidence that this ever took place in this verb; for it cannot be affirmed, that it holds of all neuter verbs indiſcriminately. Beſides, there is no MS. which reads μηδενα, and there is no neceſſity, in the preſent caſe, for even a ſmall deviation from the acknowledged reading, or from the ordinary acceptation of the words. In further ſupport of the tranſlation here given, let it be obſerved, that what commonly proves the greateſt hindrance to our lending, particularly to needy perſons, is the dread that we ſhall never be repaid. It is, I imagine, to prevent the influence of ſuch an over-cautious miſtruſt, that our Lord here warns us not to ſhut our hearts againſt the requeſt of a brother in difficulties. 'Lend cheerfully,' as though he had ſaid, 'without 'fearing the loſs of what ſhall be thus beſtowed. 'It often happens that, even contrary to appearances, 'the loan is thankfully returned by the borrower; but 'if it ſhould not, remember (and let this ſilence all 'your doubts) that God chargeth himſelf with what 'you give from love to him, and love to your neigh-'bour. He is the poor man's ſurety.' It may not be improper to add, that ſeveral La. MSS. read, agreeably to the interpretation here given *nihil deſperantes*. It is not impoſſible, that from *deſperantes* has ſprung, through the inadvertency, or haſte, of ſome tranſcriber, the preſent reading *inde ſperantes*.

CHAP. VII.

5. *It was he who built,* αυτος ωκοδομησεν. E. T. *He hath built.* The pronoun αυτος is, here, evidently emphatical,

phatical, being otherwiſe unneceſſary. It is only in ſome ſuch way as that taken in this verſion, that the emphaſis can be expreſſed in Eng. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 32.

5. *Our ſynagogue,* την συναγωγην ημων. E. T. *Us a ſynagogue.* Had the expreſſion in Gr. been συναγωγην ημιν, without the article, it could not have been more exactly rendered than as in the common tranſlation; but, with the article, it evidently denotes, either that there was but one ſynagogue in that city, or that there was only one in which thoſe elders were concerned, namely, that built by the centurion. In either caſe, it ought to be *our ſynagogue.*

9. *Admired him,* εθαυμασεν αυτον. Vul. *Miratus eſt;* agreeably to which verſion the Cam. and two other MSS. omit αυτον.

11. *Accompanied by his diſciples,* συνεπορευοντο αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου ικανοι. E. T. *Many of his diſciples went with him.* But ικανοι is wanting in three of the principal MSS. and in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. verſions, there is no word anſwering to it. It is, therefore, rejected by ſome critics.

29. *All the people.* I have marked this, and the following verſe, as the words of Jeſus. Some have, improperly, conſidered them as ſpoken by the Evangeliſt, acquainting us that the people who heard what Jeſus ſaid at this time, concerning John, glorified God, by an immediate recourſe to John for baptiſm. But this cannot be the ſenſe, for John was then, as we learn from Mt. xi. 2. in priſon, where he remained till his death, and ſo had it no longer in his power to baptize any. Beſides, it was John's office to bring diſciples to Jeſus, whoſe harbinger he was, and not the office of Jeſus to bring diſciples to John.

30. *Have rejected the counſel of God with regard to themſelves,* την βουλην του Θεου ηθετησαν εις εαυτους. E. T. *Rejected the counſel of God againſt themſelves;* meaning, doubtleſs, *they againſt themſelves* (that is, *to their own prejudice*), *rejected the counſel of God.* This ſenſe is good, but it is ambiguouſly expreſſed in the common tranſlation. Our tranſlators have alſo given, on the margin, another verſion, which is preferred by ſeveral *They rejected within themſelves the counſel of God.* I think, with Gro. that, of the three ſenſes given above, the firſt is worthy of the preference. The prepoſition εις often denotes *with regard to, in relation to.* The ſecond meaning, which is that of the common verſion, does not naturally ariſe from the words. And to ſay, *they rejected within themſelves,* ſeems not very appoſite to what follows in the ſentence, which ſhows that the rejection was open and notorious.

31. Ειπε δε ο Κυριος. E. T. *And the Lord ſaid.* But in Gr. this clauſe is wanting in almoſt all the MSS. both of great and of ſmall account. It is in neither of the Sy. verſions, nor in the Arm. Eth. Cop. and Sax. In many La. MSS. alſo, and ancient commentaries, it is not to be found. It is omitted by ſome of the beſt editors, and rejected by Gro. Mill, Wet. and other critics. If I might indulge a conjecture, as to what has given riſe to the inſertion of theſe words, I ſhould ſay, that ſome reader, miſtaking the two preceding verſes for the words of the hiſtorian, has thought ſome ſuch clauſe neceſſary for preventing miſtakes, by ſhowing that our Lord, in what followed, reſumed the diſcourſe. The ſtrong evidence which we have, that this is an interpolation, proves alſo, in ſome degree, that there was no interruption in our Lord's diſcourſe, and that, conſequently, the two preceding verſes are part of it.

35. *But wiſdom is juſtified by all her children,* και εδικαιωθη η σοφια απο των τεκνων αυτης παντων. Caſ. *Ita ſuis omnibus aliena ſapientia.* This moſt extraordinary interpretation that author defends in a note on the parallel paſſage, Mt. xi. 19. The examples which he produces ſhow, indeed, that δικαιειν ſometimes means to releaſe or deliver from evil or danger; and to this its moſt common ſignification is nearly related. *To juſtify* (which is, originally a law term, and coincides with *to acquit, to abſolve*), neceſſarily implies deliverance from the evil of a criminal accuſation, and the danger of puniſhment. But this is very different from the ſenſe given, in his tranſlation, of this verſe, which is, *alienated from, averſe to.* Had his rendering been *liberata,* or *ſoluta eſt fatuitia,* his quotations would have been a little more to the purpoſe. Elſner goes ſtill farther, and maintains that εδικαιωθη ought here to be rendered, *is condemned.* And for this ſignification he produces, as vouchers, Euripides and Thucydides, the purity of whoſe language, if that concerned the preſent queſtion, will not be diſputed. But it is ſurpriſing, that though δικαιειν is one of the moſt common verbs in the N. T. in the Gr. verſion of the Old, and in the Apocryphal books, written in the idiom of the ſynagogue, a ſingle example has not been found in any of theſe to ſupport an interpretation ſo foreign to the manner of the ſacred writers, who confeſſedly, in every other inſtance, employ the term in a favourable meaning, and with very little difference of ſignification. The uniformity on this head is, indeed, ſo great, that it is not eaſy to conceive any one of them uſing it in a ſenſe ſo contrary to its univerſal acceptation among them, without, at the ſame time, ſuppoſing him to have intended either to miſlead his readers, or to expreſs himſelf ſo as not to be underſtood by them. For, muſt he not have been ſenſible that, if he had intended to ſay *juſtified,* vindicated, εδικαιωθη is the very term he would have uſed? We have all the reaſon in the world to think ſo from their uniform practice. Now, could any man in his ſenſes, who ſeriouſly deſigned to ſpeak intelligibly, uſe the ſame term for expreſſing things ſo oppoſite as *to juſtify* and *to condemn?* Was it that the language afforded no term appropriated to this laſt ſignification? The want of proper words

ſometimes, no doubt, occaſions the recourſe to ſuch as are equivocal. But there was no want here; κατακρινειν, καταδικαζειν, κατεγινωσκειν, were quite ſuitable, and in familiar uſe. To conclude; the groſs impropriety of uſing δικαιουν here for *to condemn*, would have been the more glaring, as the ſame verb had been uſed in this very diſcourſe, v. 29. (a paſſage to which the preſent bears a manifeſt reference) in its ordinary acceptation. I need ſcarcely add, that I am of the opinion of Gro. on this point, that what is called *the counſel of God*, v. 30. is here denominated *wiſdom*, and that by *her children* are not meant the wiſe and learned, in the world's account, ſuch as their ſcribes and doctors of the law, a race remarkably arrogant and contemptuous; but the unaſſuming, the humble, and the pious inquirers into the will of God. This interpretation, which is the moſt obvious to a tranſlator, becauſe reſulting from the moſt common acceptation of the words, appears to me the moſt perſpicuous in itſelf, and the beſt ſuited to the ſcope of the diſcourſe.

38. *Standing behind.* Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 3, 4, 5, 6.
Weeping, κλαιουσα. This word is wanting in one Gr. MS. and is not rendered in the Vul. nor the Sax.

45. *Since ſhe entered*, αφ' ης εισηλθεν. E. T. *Since the time I came in.* I have, in this inſtance, ventured to give the preference to the reading which has the weaker ſupport of MSS. (for they are but a few, and not the moſt conſiderable, which read εισηλθεν); firſt, on account of the authority which the moſt ancient and reſpectable tranſlations give it; for thus the Vul. both the Sy. and the Cop. read: Secondly, becauſe the difference in writing is ſo inconſiderable, that the ſmalleſt inadvertency, either in copying, or in attending to what is dictated by another, may account for it; the whole ariſing from the miſtake of one ſmall letter for another, the ε for the ο: Thirdly, the greater internal probability there is in the reading of the Vul. from its agreeing better with the context, which repreſents the woman as coming to Simon's houſe (v. 37.) after ſhe had learnt that Jeſus was there. Now, if Jeſus was there before her, the action could be dated only from her entering, not from his. So ſlight a circumſtance as this in the connection is very apt to be overlooked in the hurry of tranſcribing, eſpecially when the words themſelves read well enough either way. But, where the difference in writing is more conſiderable, a reading ought not to be ſo eaſily admitted in favour of the ſcope of the place againſt a great plurality of MSS. becauſe in this caſe the alteration cannot be ſo plauſibly charged on overſight.

47. *Therefore her love is great*, ότι ηγαπησε πολυ. E. T. *For ſhe loved much.* Beau. *C'eſt pour cela qu'elle a tant aimé.* The whole context ſhows that the particle ότι is illative and not cauſal in this place. The parable of the debtors clearly repreſents the gratuitous forgiveneſs as the cauſe of the love, not the love as the cauſe of the forgiveneſs. And this, on the other hand, is, v. 50th, aſcribed to her faith. This interchange of the conjunctions ότι and διοτι, in the ſcriptural idiom, has been well illuſtrated by Ham. Wh. and Markland. See Boyer's conjectures.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Proclaiming the joyful tidings of the reign of God*, κηρυσσων και ευαγγελιζομενος την βασιλειαν του Θεου. The import of both the participles here uſed is fully expreſſed in the verſion; only the latter points more directly to the nature of the meſſage, *joyful tidings*, the former to the manner of executing it, to wit, by proclamation. Diſſ. VI. P. V.

15. *Continue to bring forth fruit*, καρποφορουσιν εν ὑπομονη. E. T. *Bring forth fruit with patience.* Υπομονη is, in the common verſion, generally rendered *patience*, for the moſt part feebly, and in this, and ſome other places, improperly. *Patience*, in the ordinary acceptation, is a virtue merely paſſive, and conſiſts in ſuffering evil with equanimity. The Gr. ὑπομονη implies much more; and, though the ſenſe now mentioned is not excluded, it generally denotes an active quality, to wit, conſtancy in purpoſe and practice. It correſponds exactly to what is with us called *perſeverance*. The word, in Scripture, which ſtrictly anſwers to the Eng. term *patience*, is μακροθυμια, commonly rendered *long-ſuffering*, and but twice *patience*. In ſeveral ſuch inſtances, when an Eng. appellative is directly formed from the La. our tranſlators, with other moderns, have implicitly followed the Vul. which ſays here, *Fructum afferunt in patientia*; nor is this the only place wherein ὑπομονη is ſo rendered in that tranſlation. Now, it deſerves our notice that, though the other La. interpreters have in this copied the Vul. they appear ſenſible that they have not expreſſed ſufficiently the import of the original, and have therefore corrected their own verſion on the margin or in the notes. Thus Be. who renders εν ὑπομονη here *cum patientia*, ſays, in a note, "ad verbum *cum perſiſtentia*." Now, though *perſiſtentia* is not a La. word, and therefore might not have been judged proper to be admitted into this tranſlation, yet, as being formed from *perſiſto*, in like manner as ὑπομονη from ὑπομενω, anſwering to *perſiſto*, it can only mean *perſeverance*, conſtancy, and ought to have been rendered *perſeverantia*, which is at once claſſical La. and expreſſive of the ſenſe, and conſequently not liable to either of the objections which may be pleaded againſt the other two. Nor is Be. ſingular in uſing the word *patientia*, though ſenſible that it does not convey the meaning. The words in L. xxi. 19. εν τη ὑπομονη ὑμων κτησασθε τας ψυχας ὑμων, Caſ. thus renders, both obſcurely and improperly, and in no reſpect literally, *Veſtrâ patientiâ veſtræ ſaluti conſulite*, putting on the margin, *Perſeverate ad extremum et ſalvi eritis*, which is a juſt interpretation of the Gr. and ought to

have been in the text. This conduct of Caſ. is the more unaccountable, as he never affects to trace the words or the conſtruction, but ſeems to have it for a conſtant rule, overlooking every other circumſtance, to expreſs the ſenſe of his author in claſſical and perſpicuous La. But I can ſee no reaſon why *patientia* ſhould be conſidered as a literal verſion of ὑπομονη, unleſs the cuſtom of finding the one in the Vul. where the other is in the Gr. has ſerved inſtead of a reaſon. Ὑπομονη is a derivative from ὑπομενω, as *patientia* from *patior*; but ὑπιμνω is never rendered *patior*, elſe I ſhould have thought that an immoderate attention to etymology (which has great influence on literal tranſlators) had given riſe to it. It is, on the other hand, not to be denied, that *patience* is, in ſome places, the proper verſion of ὑπομονη; nor is it difficult, from the connection, to diſcover when that term expreſſes the ſenſe. For example, when it is ſpoken of as neceſſary in affliction, under temptation, or during the delay of any promiſed good, nobody is at a loſs to diſcover what is the virtue recommended. But where there is nothing in the context to limit it in this manner, it ought to be rendered by ſome ſuch word as *perſeverance*, *continuance*, *conſtancy*; and, conſidering the ordinary import of the verb ὑπομενω, this may be called a more literal, becauſe a more analogical, as well as a more exact, interpretation than the other. The impropriety of the common rendering is, in ſome places, manifeſt. How awkardly is δι' ὑπομονης τρεχωμεν (Heb. xii. 3.) repreſented by *Let us run with patience?* So paſſive a quality as patience is ill adapted to expreſs the unintermitted activity exerted in running. Better, *Let us run without intermiſſion.* And to produce but one other example from the ſame epiſtle, x. 36. Ὑπομονης γαρ εχετε χρειαν, ἱνα το θελημα του Θεου ποιησαντες, κομισησθε την επαγγελιαν, which, in the common verſion, runs thus, *For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promiſe.* Here, not only is the expreſſion weak and obſcure, but the ſentiment is different. It muſt be owned, however, that this rendering of ὑπομονη is not the only thing exceptionable in the tranſlation of the ſentence. Χρεια, in ſuch phraſes, generally implies more than is denoted by our word *need*, or by the La. word *opus*. It expreſſes not only what is uſeful, but what is neceſſary, what cannot be diſpenſed with. For this reaſon, I prefer the expreſſion of the Vul. *Patientia enim vobis neceſſaria eſt*, to that of Be. *Nam patiente animo vobis eſt opus.* Another error is in rendering επαγγελια in this place *promiſe*, and not *promiſed reward*, agreeably to a very common Heb. idiom. The ſenſe evidently is, *For ye muſt perſevere in doing the will of God, that ye may obtain the promiſed reward.*

27. *A man of the city*, ανηρ τις εκ της πολεως. The import of which is evidently here, 'a man belonging 'to the city,' not 'a man coming from the city.' The Vul. ſays ſimply, *vir quidam*, but has nothing to anſwer to εκ της πολεως. In this it is ſingular.

29. *Demons*, δαιμονια. Vul. *Dæmonium.* As in this diverſity alſo, the Vul. has no ſupport from either MSS. or verſions, it is enough to mention it.

31. *The abyſs*, την αβυσσον. E. T. *The deep.* The meaning of this word in Eng. is invariably *the ſea.* In this ſenſe it occurs often in Scripture. We find it in this Goſpel, ch. v. 4. where the Gr. word rendered *the deep* is το βαθος. That the ſea is not meant here, is evident; for to the ſea the demons went of themſelves when permitted, at their own requeſt, to enter into the ſwine. For the proper import of the word *abyſs*, in the Jewiſh uſe, ſee Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 14.

34. *Fled, and ſpread the news*, εφυγον και απελθοντες απηγγειλαν. E. T. *Fled, and went and told.* But the word απελθοντες, anſwering to *went*, is wanting in almoſt all the MSS. of any account, in the Vul. both the Sy. the Go. the Sax. Cop. and Ara. verſions, in ſome of the moſt eminent editions, and is generally rejected by critics.

36. *In what manner the demoniac had been delivered*, πως εσωθη ὁ δαιμονισθεις. Vul. *Quamodo ſanus factus eſſet a legione.* This reading appears to be equally unſupported with the two former.

41. *A ruler of the ſynagogue*—to wit, of Capernaum.

47. *Having thrown herſelf proſtrate, declared to him, before all the people, why ſhe had touched him*, προσπεσουσα αυτω, δι' ἡν αιτιαν ἡψατο αυτου, απηγγειλεν αυτω, ενωπιον παντος του λαου. E. T. *Falling down before him, ſhe declared unto him, before all the people, for what cauſe ſhe had touched him.* As the ſecond αυτω is not found in ſeveral MSS. ſome of them of note; as there is nothing which correſponds to it in theſe ancient tranſlations, the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. and the Cop. and as it ſeems rather ſuperfluous, I have omitted it in this verſion, taking the firſt αυτω to be governed by the verb απηγγειλεν.

48. *Take courage*, θαρσει. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and there is nothing correſponding to it in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. verſions.

51. *Being come to the houſe*, εισελθων δε εις την οικιαν. E. T. *And when he came into the houſe.* But the greater number of MSS. eſpecially thoſe of principal note, read ελθων ſimply. This has alſo been read by the authors of the Vul. of both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. and the Sax. verſions. It is in ſome of the beſt editions, and is approved by Mill and Wet. The other reading ſeems not quite conſiſtent with the following part of the verſe.

51. *Peter, and John, and James.* E. T. *Peter, and James, and John.* The copies, evangeliſtaries, La. MSS. editions, and verſions, which, in exhibiting theſe names, follow the firſt order, both out-number and out-weigh thoſe which follow the ſecond. I acknowledge

ledge that it is a matter of very little conſequence which of the two has been the original order; but as the arrangement here adopted is peculiar to this Evangeliſt (for it occurs again, ch. ix. 28.; whereas both Mt. and Mr. ſay always *James and John*), I thought it ſafer, where poſſible, to preſerve the peculiarities of each, even in the ſmalleſt matters.

54. *Having made them all retire,* εκβαλων εξω παντας. Theſe words are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. The clauſe is wanting alſo in the Vul. the Sax. and the Eth. verſions.

CHAP. IX.

1. *The twelve,* τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου. E. T. *His twelve diſciples.* The words μαθητας αυτου are wanting in a very great number of MSS. ſome of them of chief note, and in ſeveral of the oldeſt editions. They are not in the firſt Sy. nor in ſome modern verſions, as Lu.'s and the Tigurine. It is to be obſerved, that even the other ancient verſions, the Vul. the ſecond Sy. the Go. the Sax. the Cop. have not read μαθητας, but αποστολους. This reading is alſo favoured by a few Gr. MSS. of little account. When the evidence of theſe different readings is compared together, the ſuperiority is manifeſtly for the rejection of the two words. They are, beſides, quite unneceſſary.

3. *Nor ſtaves,* μητε ραβδους. Vul. *Neque virgam.* In this reading the Vul. has the ſanction of a pretty large number of MSS. and of the Sy. Eth. and Ara. verſions. The balance, however, is againſt it.

4. *Continue in whatever houſe ye are received into, until ye leave the place,* εις ην αν οικιαν εισελθητε, εκει μενετε, και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε. E. T. *Whatſoever houſe ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart.* This way of rendering, though it appears to be literal, is very unintelligible, and conveys no determinate meaning. It ſeems even to be ſelf-contradictory. Vul. *In quamcunque domum intraveritis, ibi manete, et inde non exeatis.* There can be no doubt that the authors of this verſion have read μη before εξερχεσθε; which is, indeed, found in one MS. but has no other authority that I know. The authors of the Sax. and the Cop. verſions ſeem, inſtead of the clauſe, και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε, to have read εως αν εξελθητε. We may, indeed, ſay with truth that, whether they read ſo or not, it was impoſſible, in a conſiſtency with the ſcope and connection, to render the ſentence otherwiſe than they have done. The parallel places in like manner confirm the opinion that this muſt be the ſenſe of the expreſſion.

23. *Daily,* καθ' ημεραν. Theſe words are wanting in ſo many and ſo conſiderable MSS. and are found in ſo many others, as might make one juſtly heſitate whether to retain or to reject them. All the ancient verſions, however, except the ſecond Sy. favour their admiſſion; and even that verſion does not exclude them; it receives them only with a mark as dubious. There is nothing, indeed, correſponding to them in the two parallel paſſages of the other Goſpels; but that is no objection, as there is nothing in either, which in the ſmalleſt degree contradicts them; and it is common, in the different Evangeliſts, to ſupply circumſtances overlooked by the others. Beſides, there is nothing in them unſuitable to the ſenſe. As to follow Chriſt is the conſtant or daily buſineſs of his diſciple, every attendant circumſtance muſt ſhare in that conſtancy. Upon the whole, the word *daily* poſſeſſes a place in the E. T. and we can ſay, at leaſt, that there does not appear ground ſufficient for diſpoſſeſſing it. Diſſ. XII. P. II. § 15.

28. Εγενετο δε—και παραλαβων— This is a mode of conſtruction not unuſual with this Evangeliſt. The και is redundant, as in ch. viii. 1. x. 38. and xxiii. 44. or it may be rendered into Eng. by the conjunction *that. It happened that:* ωσει ημεραι οκτω may, doubtleſs, as Elſner propoſes, be included in a parentheſis.

31. *The departure,* την εξοδον. E. T. *The deceaſe.* Though ſome have put a different meaning upon the words, it was, doubtleſs, our Lord's *death* which was the ſubject of their diſcourſe. It muſt, at the ſame time, be acknowledged, that the word εξοδος does not neceſſarily imply this, it being the term by which the departure of the Iſraelites from Egypt was commonly expreſſed, and the name given by the Seventy to the ſecond book of Moſes. As it may not have been without deſign, that the common names for death, θανατος and τελευτη, were avoided by the Evangeliſt, I thought it better to uſe here the word *departure,* which is of equal latitude with that of the original.

45. *It was veiled to them, that they might not apprehend it,* ην παρακεκαλυμμενον απ' αυτων, ινα μη αισθωνται αυτο. E. T. *It was hid from them, that they perceived it not.* The words are ſuſceptible of either interpretation; for though the common ſignification of ινα is *to the end that,* yet, in the N. T. it frequently denotes no more than *ſo that.* Here, however, the former clauſe appears to me ſo ſtrongly expreſſed, as to juſtify the tranſlation I have given of both. If the hiſtorian had employed an adjective, as ασαφης, or κρυπτος, and not the paſſive participle, of an active verb, παρακεκαλυμμενον, the conjunction might, with greater probability, have been interpreted *ſo that.* But, as it ſtands, it ſeems to expreſs ſomething intentional. Nor let it be imagined that this criticiſm is a mere refinement. Who would not be ſenſible of the difference, in Eng. between ſaying that an expreſſion is *dark,* and ſaying that it has been *darkened,* or made dark? Now this is very ſimilar to the caſe in hand. Allow me to add, that there is no impropriety in ſuppoſing that predictions were intentionally expreſſed ſo as not to be perfectly underſtood

at

at the time; but ſo as to make an impreſſion, which would ſecure their being remembered till the accompliſhment ſhould diſpel every doubt. Diſſ. XII. P. II. § 11 and 12.

48. *He who is leaſt amongſt you all ſhall be greateſt*, ὁ μικροτερος ἐν πασιν ὑμιν ὑπαρχων ὁυτος ἐσαι μεγας. E. T. *He that is leaſt among you all, the ſame ſhall be great.* By a very common Hebraiſm, the poſitive ſupplies the place, ſometimes of the comparative, ſometimes of the ſuperlative. Thus, Gen. i. 16. *God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the leſſer light to rule the night.* So the words are rendered in the Eng. Bible. In Heb. it is *the great light*, and *the little light.* In the verſion of the Seventy, the former clauſe is expreſſed thus, τον φωσφορον τον μειζονα εις ἀρχας της ἡμερας. Again, Mt. xxii. 36. *Which is the greateſt commandment in the law?* ποια ἐντολη μεγαλη ἐν τω νομω; And, in regard to the paſſage now under examination, as the contention among the diſciples was, which of them ſhould be *the greateſt* (for, doubtleſs, they expected that they ſhould all be *great*), there can be no reaſonable doubt about the import of the term.

50. *Whoever is not againſt us, is for us*, ὁς ὐκ ἐστι καθ' ἡμων, ὑπερ ἡμων ἐστιν. A conſiderable number of MSS. and ſome of principal note, read ὑμων in both places. It is in this way rendered by the Vul. both the Sy. Go. Sax. Eth. and Ara. verſions. But, though this ſhould be thought to render the true reading doubtful, one thing is clear, that the difference does not affect the ſenſe.

51. *As the time of his removal approached*, ἐγενετο δε ἐν τω συμπληρουσθαι τας ἡμερας της ἀναλημψεως αὐτου. E. T. *And it came to paſs, when the time was come that he ſhould be received up.* Ἀναλημψις does not occur in any other place of the N. T.; nor is it found in the Sep.; but being derived from ἀναλαμβανω, which is uſed pretty often in both, we can hardly be at a loſs about the ſignification. The verb admits a good deal of latitude; for though it is ſometimes, in the paſſive voice, applied to our Saviour's aſſumption into heaven, and ſignifies to be taken up; it is not confined, in the N. T. to that meaning, and has but rarely ſuch an acceptation in the Gr. of the Seventy. The old La. tranſlator, who renders ἀναλημψις, here, *aſſumptio*, has probably meant this; and to this effect our Eng. tranſlators have, ſtill more explicitly rendered τας ἡμερας της ἀναλημψεως αὐτου, *the time that he ſhould be received up.* Yet, to me, it appears very improbable that the Evangeliſt ſhould ſpeak of the time of his aſcenſion as being come, or juſt at hand, not only before his reſurrection, but even before his trial and death; eſpecially, conſidering that he continued no fewer than forty days on the earth after he was riſen. The word ἀναλημψις is equally applicable to any other method of removing. Accordingly, ſome Fr. tranſlators, even from the Vul. have underſtood the *dies aſſumptionis ejus* of his death. Both in the P. R. verſion, and in Sa.'s, it is rendered, *Le tems auquel il devoit etre enlevé du monde.* From theſe Si. differs, only in ſaying, ——*de ce monde.* But though this probably expreſſes the meaning, yet, as it is more explicit than the words of the Evangeliſt, I have preferred a ſimpler manner, and uſed a term of nearly the ſame extent of ſignification with the Gr. The word συμπληρουσθαι in ſtrictneſs, denotes that the time *was come.* But we all know that, in popular language, a time is often ſaid to be come which is very near. Beſides, whatever be *the removal* alluded to, the circumſtances cloſely connected with it, or introductory to it, may well be underſtood as comprehended. This ſeems ſtrongly indicated here, by the indefinite turn of the expreſſion, τας ἡμερας, *the days*, της ἀναλημψεως αὐτου; whereas the actual removal, whether by death, or by aſcenſion, occupied but a ſmall part of one day.

52. *A village*, κωμην. Vul. *Civitatem.* A few inconſiderable MSS. with The. read πολιν.

54. *As Elijah did*, ὡς και Ηλιας ἐποιησε. This clauſe is wanting in two MSS. and in the Vul. and Sax. verſions.

CHAP. X.

1. *Seventy others*, ἑτερους ἑβδομηκοντα. E. T. *Other ſeventy.* But this expreſſion implies that there were ſeventy ſent before. Now, this is not the fact (thoſe ſent before being no more than twelve), nor is it implied in the Gr. So inconſiderable a difference in the words makes a great alteration in the ſenſe.

2. *Seventy*, ἑβδομηκοντα. Vul. *Septuaginta duos.* Thus alſo the Sax. The Vat. the Cam. and one other MS. read οβ, which is the numeral mark for 72.

4. *Salute no perſon by the way;*—Let not matters of mere compliment detain you.

6. *If a ſon of peace be there*, ἐαν μεν ἡ ἐκει ὁ ὑιος εἰρηνης E. T. *If the ſon of peace be there.* The article before ὑιος is wanting in many MSS. ſome of them of great name, in all the beſt editions, and in the comments of ſeveral Fathers. As to ancient verſions, this is one of thoſe particulars, about which we cannot ſafely determine, whether they read the one way or the other. Neither the Sy. nor the La. has articles; and thoſe languages which have them do not perfectly coincide with one another in the uſe of them. In the preſent caſe, the ſcope of the paſſage clearly ſhows that the word is uſed indefinitely. *Son of peace*, here, is equivalent to *worthy* in the parallel paſſage in Mt. The import, therefore, is, manifeſtly, 'If a perſon of worth, 'or deſerving your good wiſhes, be there.'

17. *The ſeventy.* The Cam. MS. the Vul. and the Sax. make them *ſeventy-two*, as in v. 1.

20. *Rejoice.*

20. *Rejoice.* The word μαλλον, *rather*, which is in the common edition, is wanting in almoſt all the MSS. editions, verſions, &c. of any conſideration, and is, therefore, juſtly rejected by critics.

21. *In ſpirit*, τω πνευματι. The Cam. and five others, prefix αγια. The Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Eth. and Sax. read ſo.

23. *Apart*, κατ' ιδιαν. This is wanting in the Cam. and is not rendered in the Vul. There is no other authority that I know, for the omiſſion.

30. *A man of Jeruſalem travelling to Jericho*, ανθρωπος τις κατεβαινεν απο Ιερουσαλημ εις Ιεριχω. E. T. *A certain man went down from Jeruſalem to Jericho.* It cannot be denied that this is a cloſe tranſlation of the words as they lie; and that, in the verſion here adopted, there is greater freedom taken with the arrangement. But, in my opinion, is it not greater than the ſcope of the place, and the practice of the ſacred writers, will warrant. As to the ſcope of the paſſage, every body perceives that it is the intention of this parable to confound thoſe malignant Jewiſh prejudices, which made them confine their charity to thoſe of their own nation and religion. Nor could any thing be better adapted for the purpoſe than this ſtory, which, as it is univerſally underſtood, exhibits a Samaritan overlooking all national and religious differences, and doing offices of kindneſs and humanity to a Jew in diſtreſs. By this means, the narrow-minded Phariſee, who put the queſtion, is ſurpriſed into a conviction, that there is ſomething amiable, and even divine, in ſurmounting all partial conſiderations, and liſtening to the voice of nature, which is the voice of God, in giving relief to the unhappy. Now, the whole energy of the ſtory depends on this circumſtance, that the perſon who received the charitable aid, was a Jew, and the perſon who gave it a Samaritan. Yet, if we do not tranſpoſe the κατεβαινεν, in this verſe, and make it follow, inſtead of preceding, απο Ιερουσαλημ, we ſhall be apt to loſe ſight of the principal view. The uſe of απο, for denoting the place to which a perſon belonged, is common: Ανθρωπος απο Αριμαθειας, Mt. xxvii. 57. Λαζαρος απο Βηθανιας, J. xi. 1. As to the tranſpoſition, inſtances much greater than the preſent, have been taken notice of already; and other inſtances will occur in theſe notes. Mt. xv. 1. N. See Bowyer's Conjectures.

32. *Likewiſe a Levite on the road, when he came near the place, and ſaw him, paſſed by on the farther ſide*, ομοιως δε και Λευιτης, γενομενος κατα τον τοπον, ελθων, και ιδων, αντιπαρηλθεν. E. T. *And likewiſe a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and paſſed by on the other ſide.* There are ſome ſtrange innacuracies in this verſion. It may be aſked, Whither did the Levite come, when he was already at the place? Or, how does his coming and looking on the wounded man, conſiſt with his paſſing by on the other ſide? Indeed, the word ελθων, in the original, appears redundant, and is wanting in a few MSS. as well as in the Vul. The word ιδων, is badly rendered *looked on*. A man is often paſſive, in ſeeing what he does not chuſe to ſee, if he could avoid it. But *to look on* implies activity and intention. I have, in this verſion, expreſſed the ſenſe, without attaching myſelf ſervilely to the words. In rendering αντιπαρηλθεν, I have preferred Be.'s *ex adverſo præteriit*, to the *pertranſivit* of the Vul. It appears to me, that it is not without deſign that this unuſual compound, αντιπαρερχεσθαι, applied to the prieſt and the Levite, is here contraſted to the αντιπαερχεσθαι, applied to the Samaritan. This is the more probable, as it is ſolely in this place that the former verb occurs in Scripture; whereas παρερχεσθαι occurs frequently in the ſacred writers, and in none oftener than in this Evangeliſt, as ſignifying to paſs on, to paſs by, or paſs away. Add to all, that this meaning of the prepoſition αντι, in compound verbs, is common, and the interpretation analogical. Beſides, the circumſtance ſuggeſted is not only ſuitable to the whole ſpirit of the parable, but natural and picturesque,

35. *When he was going away*, εξιων. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and is not rendered in the Vul. Sy. Eth. Sax. and Ara. verſions.

CHAP. XI.

2. 4. The words, in theſe verſes, incloſed in crotchets, have nothing in the Vul. correſponding to them, nor in the Arm. verſion. They are wanting alſo in ſeveral MSS. Some of the Fathers have given what I may call, a negative teſtimony againſt their admiſſion, by omitting them in thoſe places of their works where we ſhould have expected to find them; but Origen's teſtimony againſt them is more poſitive; for he ſays, expreſsly, of ſome of thoſe clauſes and petitions, that they are in Mt. but not in L. It deſerves to be remarked, alſo, that he does not ſay (though in theſe matters he is wont to be accurate) that thoſe expreſſions are not found in many copies of L.'s Goſpel, but, ſimply, that L. has them not. This would lead one to think, that he had not found them in any tranſcript of that Goſpel which had come under his notice, though far the moſt eminent ſcriptural critic of his time; and that they were, conſequently, an interpolation of a later-date. Whatever be in this, ſome of our beſt modern critics, Gro. Ben. Mill, and Wet. ſeem to be agreed that, in this place, we are indebted for them to ſome bold tranſcribers, who have conſidered it as a neceſſary correction, to ſupply what they thought deficient in one Goſpel out of another. See the notes on Mt. vi. 10, &c.

3. *Each day*, το καθ' ημεραν. Inſtead of this, the Cam. and ſix other MSS. read σημερον. Thus, the author of the Vul. has read, who ſays *hodie*. This is alſo followed by the Sax. verſion. Yet in no other

part of this prayer does that verſion follow the Vul. but the Gr.

6. *Off his road,* εξ ὁδου. E. T. *In his journey.* The tranſlation, here given, is evidently cloſer; beſides, it ſtrengthens the argument.

7. *I and my children are in bed,* τα παιδια μου, μετ' εμου, εις την κοιτην εισιν. E. T. *My children are with me in bed.* That μετ' εμου does not neceſſarily imply that he and his children were in the ſame bed, but only that the children were gone to bed as well as he, has been ſhown by many critics. I ſhall, therefore, only refer the Gr. ſtudent to the following, amongſt other, paſſages which might be quoted, wherein, if he looked into the original, he will find that the prepoſitions, μετα and συν, often denote no more than the former of theſe, in the interpretation above given, denotes here, Mt. ii. 3. 1 Cor. xvi. 11. Eph. iii. 18.

8. *If the other continue knocking.* Vul. *Si ille perſeveraverit pulſans.* Words correſponding to theſe are not found either in the Gr. or in the Sy. Nor can we plead the authority of MSS. The beſt argument in their favour is, that they ſeem to be neceſſary to the ſenſe; for a man could not be ſaid to be importunate, for having aſked a favour only once. As the paſſage, therefore, needed the aid of ſome words, and as theſe are adapted to the purpoſe, and have been long in poſſeſſion; for the old Itc. and the Sax. verſions read ſo, as well as the Vul. I thought it better to retain them, adding the mark by which I diſtinguiſh words inſerted for the ſake of perſpicuity, from thoſe of the inſpired penmen.

13. *How much more will your Father give from heaven,* ποσω μαλλον ὁ πατηρ ὁ εξ ουρανου δωσει. E. T. *How much more ſhall your heavenly Father give.* Vul. *Quanto magis Pater veſter cælo dabit.* Thus we read in the edition authoriſed by Pope Sixtus Quintus; whereas, after Pope Clement's corrections, it is *pater cæleſtis;* but in two old editions, one publiſhed at Paris in 1504, the other at Lyons in 1512, we have both readings conjoined, *Pater veſter cæleſtis de cælo dabit,* with a note on the margin of the latter, inſinuating that ſome copies have not the word *cæleſtis.* The Sy. reads exactly as the Vul. of Sixtus Quintus. So do alſo the Cop. and the Sax. Some Gr. MSS. likewiſe omit the ὁ, and read ὑμων after πατηρ. This makes the moſt natural expreſſion, and appears to have been the reading of the moſt ancient tranſlators. Gro. and ſome other critics, have thought that πατηρ ὁ εξ ουρανου, is equivalent to πατηρ ὁ εν τω ουρανω, or εν τοις ουρανοις. I can find no evidence of this opinion. Such a periphraſis for God, in this or in any other ſacred writer, is without example; and the expreſſions which have been produced, as ſimilar, are not appoſite, I ſee no reaſon, therefore, for imputing ſo ſtrange an affectation to the Evangeliſt. I have, therefore, followed the Sy. which differs in nothing from the common Gr. except in reading ὑμων after πατηρ, inſtead of ὁ.

13. *The holy Spirit,* πνευμα ἁγιον. Vul. *Spiritum bonum.* The Cam. αγαθον δωμα, three others, πνευμα αγαθον, agreeably to the Vul. Eth. Sax. and Arm. verſions.

17. *One family falling after another,* και οικος επι οικον πιπτει. E. T. *And a houſe divided againſt a houſe falleth.* Vul. *Et domus ſupra domum cadit.* Er. and Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe. Our tranſlators have, by following Be. imperfectly, been drawn into the hardly intelligible verſion they have given of this paſſage. Be. ſays *Et domus adverſus ſeſe diſſidens radit.* This tranſlation is founded on the parallel paſſages in Mt. and Mr.; for nobody could have ſo tranſlated the words of L. who had not recurred to the other hiſtorians. Now, though this method is often convenient, and ſometimes neceſſary, it ſhould not be uſed when the words, as they lie, are not obſcure, but yield a meaning which is both juſt and appoſite. Beſides, the conſtruction obſerved throughout the whole paſſage, and even in the parallel places, renders it probable, if not certain, that if the Evangeliſt's meaning had been the ſame with Be.'s he would have ſaid, οικος εφ' ἑαυτον, which, though elliptical, might, poſſibly, by one who had read no other Goſpel, have been apprehended to convey that ſenſe. In the way it is expreſſed, it could never have been ſo underſtood by any body.

36. *By its flame,* τη αστραπη. Such is the import of the Gr. word in this place. It is oftenеſt applied to *lightning,* but not limited to that meaning.

38. *But the Phariſee was ſurpriſed to obſerve that he uſed no waſhing after dinner,* ὁ δε φαρισαιος ἰδων εθαυμασεν, ὁτι ου πρωτον εβαπτισθη προ του αριστου. Vul. *Phariſæus autem cæpit intra ſe reputans dicere, quare non baptizatus eſſet ante prandium.* Agreeably to this verſion, the Cam. inſtead of ἰδων εθαυμασεν, ὁτι, ſays, ἠρξατο διακρινομενος εν ἑαυτω λεγειν ὁτι. But in this it appears to be ſingle.

39. *Malevolence,* πονηριας. Vul. *Iniquitate.* This ſeems to ſuggeſt that the interpreter had read ανομιας. But I have not heard of any example of this reading.

41. *Only give in alms what ye have,* πλην τα ενοντα δοτε ελεημοσυνην. E. T. *But rather give alms of ſuch things as ye have.* Τα ενοντα, *quæ penes aliquem ſunt,* what a man is poſſeſſed of: δοτε τα ενοντα, and δοτε εκ των ενοντων, are not ſynonymous. The latter expreſsly commands to give a part; the former does not expreſsly command to give the whole, but does not exclude that ſenſe. The words, in the E. T. are an unexceptionable verſion of the latter. Τα ὑπαρχοντα (ch. xii. 33.) has nearly the ſame meaning with τα ενοντα here. Our Lord, in diſcourſing on this topic, took a two-fold view of the ſubject, both tending to the ſame end. The firſt and ſubordinate view was, that the cleanneſs of the inſide of veſſels is of as much conſequence,

quence, at leaſt, as that of the outſide; the ſecond and principal view was, that moral cleanneſs, or purity of mind, is much more important than ceremonial cleanneſs, reſulting from frequent waſhings. Theſe views are ſometimes blended in the diſcourſe. Under the metaphor of veſſels, human beings are repreſented, whereof the body anſwers to that which is without, the ſoul to that which is within. Body and ſoul, argues our Lord, had both the ſame author, and the one, eſpecially the more ignoble part, ought not to engroſs our regards, to the neglect of the more noble: and even as to veſſels, the genuine way of cleanſing them, in a moral and ſpiritual ſenſe, is by making them the inſtruments of conveying relief to the diſtreſſed and needy.

44. *Scribes and Phariſees, hypocrites,* γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι, ὑποκριται. We have no tranſlation of theſe words in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. verſions. They are wanting alſo in four MSS. The Cam. has them; as alſo the Sax. verſion; whence I think it probable that they were in the Itc. verſion.

47, &c. *Woe unto you, becauſe ye build*—— We are not to underſtand this, as though any part of the guilt lay in building or adorning the tombs of the Prophets, conſidered in itſelf; but in their falſeneſs, in giving this teſtimony of reſpect to the Prophets, whilſt they were actuated by the ſpirit, and following the example, of their perſecutors and murderers; inſomuch that they appeared to erect thoſe ſepulchres, not to do honour to God's Prophets, but to ſerve as eternal monuments of the ſucceſs of their progenitors in deſtroying them.

54. *Laying ſnares for him, in order to draw*—— ενεδρευοντες αυτον και ζητησαι θηρευσαι. E. T. *Laying wait for him, and ſeeking to catch*—— But the copulative και, which makes all the difference in meaning between theſe two Eng. verſions, is wanting in ſo great a number of MSS. amongſt which are thoſe of principal note, in ſo many editions, verſions, &c. that it is juſtly rejected by Mill, Wet. and other critics.

CHAP. XII.

5. *Into hell,* εις την γεενναν. Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 1.

15. *For in whatever affluence a man be his life depends not on his poſſeſſions,* οτι ουκ εν τω περισσευειν τινι η ζωη αυτου εστιν εκ των υπαρχοντων αυτω. E. T. *For a man's life conſiſteth not in the abundance of the things which he poſſeſſeth.* Vul. *Quia non in abundantia cujuſquam vita ejus eſt ex his quæ poſſidet.* Maldonat's obſervation on this paſſage is well founded, "Difficiliora ſunt verba "quam ſenſus." All interpreters are agreed about the meaning, however much they differ about the conſtruction. The E. T. without keeping cloſe to the words, has expreſſed the ſenſe rather more obſcurely than either the Gr. or the La. The two clauſes in the Gr. are combined into one; and εστιν εκ ſeems to be rendered *conſiſteth in.* The tranſlators of P. R. appear to be the firſt who have expreſſed the meaning perſpicuouſly in modern language, *Car en quelque abondance qu'un homme ſoit, ſa vie ne depend point des biens qu'il poſſede.* In this they have been followed by ſubſequent interpreters.

25. *Beſides, which of you can, by his anxiety, prolong his life one hour?* τις δε εξ υμων μεριμνων δυναται προσθειναι επι την ηλικιαν αυτου πηχυν ενα. E. T. *And which of you, with taking thought, can add to his ſtature one cubit?* Ηλικια ſignifies both *ſtature,* and *age* or *lifetime.* For examples of the latter acceptation, ſee Job. ix. 21. 23. Heb. xi. 11. In every caſe, therefore, the words ought to be rendered by the one or the other of theſe terms which beſt ſuits the context. Πηχυς is properly a meaſure of length, and may, on that account, be thought inapplicable to time. But let it be obſerved, that few tropes are more familiar than thoſe wherein ſuch meaſures are applied to the age or life of man. *Behold,* ſays the Pſalmiſt, *thou haſt made my days an handbreadth,* Pſ. xxxix. 5. Ιδου, παλαιστας εθου τας ημερας μου. The common verſion ſays, *as an handbreadth;* but the word *as* is ſupplied by the interpreters, and has nothing correſponding to it either in the Heb. or in the Gr. Ham. has quoted from Mimnermus, an ancient poet, the phraſe πηχυιον επι χρονον, literally *for a cubit of time,* that is, for a very ſhort time. Analogous to this is the common compariſon of life to a race, or to a journey. This may ſuffice to ſhow, that there is no violence done to the words of the Evangeliſt, in making them relate to a man's age, or term of life, and not to his ſtature. But whether they actually relate to the one or to the other, is beſt determined from the context. It is evident, that the warnings which our Lord gives here, and in the parallel paſſage in Mt. againſt anxiety, particularly regard the two eſſential articles of food and raiment, which engroſs the attention of the much greater part of mankind. Food is neceſſary for the preſervation of life, and raiment for the protection of our bodies from the injuries of the weather. Anxiety about food is, therefore, cloſely connected with anxiety about life; but, except in children, or very young perſons, who muſt have been an inconſiderable part of Chriſt's audience, has no connection with anxiety about ſtature. Accordingly, it is the preſervation of life, and the protection of the body, which our Lord himſelf points to, as the ultimate aim of all thoſe perplexing cares. *Is not life,* ſays he, *a greater gift than food, and the body than raiment?* And if ſo, will not God, who gave the greater gift, life, give alſo food, which, though a ſmaller gift, is neceſſary for ſupporting the other? In like manner, will not he who gave the body, give the raiment neceſſary for its defence? All this is entirely conſequential, and our Lord, in theſe warnings, touches what occupies the daily reflections

reflections and labour of more than nine tenths of mankind. But, in what is ſaid about ſtature, if we underſtand the word ſo, he appears to ſtart aſide from what employs the time and attention of the people in every age and country, to what could be an object only to children, and a very few fooliſh young perſons. In the verſe immediately following, we have an additional evidence that the word is employed here metaphorically, and that the diſcourſe ſtill concerns the ſame ſubject, food and raiment, or the preſervation of life, and the accommodation of the body. *If ye cannot*, ſays he, *the effect, even the ſmalleſt thing*, ελαχιστον, *why are ye anxious about the reſt?* In reſpect of ſtature, would a cubit be called the ſmalleſt thing, which is more than one fourth of the whole? This would have been more ſuitable if the word had been *an inch*. In every view, therefore, that we take of the matter, it is extremely improbable that there is here any mention of ſtature. The idea is foreign to the ſcope of the diſcourſe; the thing ſaid is ill-ſuited to the words connected with it, and ill-adapted to the hearers, as it proceeds on the hypotheſis, that a ſort of ſolicitude was general among them, which cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to have affected one hundredth part of them. It is a very ingenious, and more than plauſible, conjecture of Wet. that ηλικια, or the ordinary term of life, is here conſidered under the figure of the *ſtadium*, or courſe gone over by the runners, of which, as it conſiſted of ſeveral hundred cubits, a ſingle *cubit* was but as one ſtep, and conſequently a very ſmall proportion of the whole, and what might not improperly be termed ελαχιστον. It adds to the credibility of this, that the life of man is once and again diſtinguiſhed in Scripture by the appellation δρομος, the courſe or ground run over by the racers. This is the more remarkable, and ſhows how much their ears were accuſtomed to the trope; as it occurs ſometimes in places where no formal compariſon is made, or even hinted, to the gymnaſtic exerciſes. Thus, Acts xiii. 25. *As John fulfilled his courſe*, ως επλήρ. τον δρομον. xx. 24. *Neither count I my life dear unto myſelf*, ſays Paul, *ſo that I might finiſh my courſe with joy*, ως τελειωσαι τον δρομον μου. And, 2 Tim. iv. 7. *I have finiſhed my courſe*, τον δρομον τετελεκα. The phraſe ο τροχος της γενεσεως, James iii. 6. has nearly the ſame ſignification. Several critics of name favour this interpretation, amongſt whom are Ham. Wet. Pearce. The An. Hey. Weſ. and Wa. adopt it. Some other interpreters give it as a probable verſion in their notes.

31. *Seek ye the kingdom of God*, ζητειτε την βασιλειαν του Θεου. Vul. *Quærite primum regnum Dei et juſtitiam ejus*. There is no countenance from either MSS. or verſions worth mentioning in favour either of *primum*, or of *et juſtitiam ejus*.

32. *My little flock*, το μικρον ποιμνιον. E. T. *Little flock*. We have here the diminutive ποιμνιον combined with the adjective μικρον, *little*. It is, therefore, an expreſſion of tenderneſs, at the ſame time that it ſuggeſts the actual ſmallneſs of their number. It has alſo the article, which we never uſe in the vocative. In our language we cannot better ſupply the diminutive and the article than by the poſſeſſive pronoun.

35. The Vul. after *ardentes*, adds *in manibus veſtris*. This variation is peculiar to that verſion. The Sax. follows the Gr.

46. *With the faithleſs*, μετα των απιστων. E. T. *With the unbelievers*. Thoſe are called here απιστοι who, in Mt. are called υποκριται. Both words have great extent of ſignification. And for the reaſon given, in the note on that paſſage, againſt rendering υποκριται *hypocrites*, απιστοι ought not here to be rendered *unbelievers*, but, according to the moſt common acceptation of the word, *the faithleſs*, that is, perſons totally unworthy of truſt.

49. *What would I, but that it were kindled?* τι θελω, ει ηδη ανηφθη; E. T. *What will I, if it be already kindled?* Vul. *Quid volo niſi ut accendatur?* Er. Zu. Be. *Quid volo, ſi jam accenſus eſt?* Caſ. *Qui, ſi jam incenſus eſt, quid volo?* It is evident to me, that the ſenſe is better expreſſed in the Vul. than by any of the modern La. interpreters. The objection which Be. and after him Palairet, make, that the ει is there tranſlated as if it were ει μη, is of no moment, ſince the ει in this verſe is, by the acknowledgment of the latter, not the hypothetical conjunction, but a particle expreſſive of a wiſh. What Gro. ſays of this rendering is entirely juſt, "in eo ſenſum recte expreſſit, verba non annu-"meravit." The very next verſe would ſufficiently evince the meaning, if there could be a reaſonable doubt about it, *I have an immerſion to undergo, and how am I pained till it be accompliſhed?* 'Since the advance-'ment of true religion, which is the greateſt bleſſing 'to mankind, muſt be attended with ſuch unhappy 'diviſions, I even long till they take place.' L. Cl. renders it in the ſame way with the Vul. *Que ſouhaite je, ſinon qu'il fût déja enflammé?* Here the meaning is expreſſed with ſimplicity and modeſty, as in the original. But I cannot help diſreliſhing much the manner in which Dod. and after him Wy. have expreſſed it, though in the general import it does not differ from the laſt mentioned. *What do I wiſh? Oh, that it were already kindled.* This form of venting a wiſh, is, in a caſe like the preſent, when he knew that the event would ſoon happen, ſtrongly expreſſive of impatience. I know not any thing whereby interpreters have more injured the native beauty of the ſtyle of Scripture than by the attempts they have ſometimes made to expreſs the ſenſe very emphatically.

58. *To ſatisfy him*, απηλλαχθαι απ' αυτου. E. T. *That thou mayeſt be delivered from him*. But a man is delivered from another who makes his eſcape from him, either by artifice or by force, or who is reſcued by another. Now the words *delivered from* ſuggeſt ſome

ſuch method of deliverance, rather than that which is here ſignified by the term απαλλαχθαι, a deliverance with conſent. To this the parallel place, Mt. v. 25. alſo evidently points.

CHAP. XIII.

9. *Perhaps it will bear fruit; if not, thou mayeſt afterwards cut it down,* κ'αν μεν ποιηση καρπον· ει δε μηγε, εις το μελλον εκκοψεις αυτην. E. T. *And if it bear fruit, well; and if not, then after that thou ſhalt cut it down.* It is plain, that there is an ellipſis in the Gr.; ſome word is wanting after καρπον to complete the ſenſe. In ſentences of the like form, in Gr. writers, when the words wanting are eaſily ſupplied by the aid of the context, this figure is not unfrequent; nay, it has ſometimes a peculiar energy. As the effect, however, is not the ſame in modern languages, it is generally thought better to complete the ſentence, either by adding the word, or words, wanting, or by making a ſmall alteration on the form of expreſſion. I have preferred the latter of theſe methods, our tranſlators have followed the former. The difference is not material.

15. *Hypocrites.* E. T. *Thou hypocrite.* In the common Gr. we read υποκριτα, in the ſingular number; but in many MSS. ſome of principal note, in the Com. and other early editions, in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Eth. Sax. and Ara. verſions we find the word in the plural. The very next words, εκαστος υμων, ſhow that our Lord's anſwer was not addreſſed ſolely to *the director*, but was intended for all thoſe preſent who eſpouſed his ſide of the queſtion. Mill, and ſeveral other critics, have preferred this reading.

25. *If once the maſter of the houſe ſhall have ariſen,* αφ' ου αν εγερθη ο οικοδεσποτης. Vul. *Cum autem intraverit paterfamilias.* In one or two copies we find εισελθη inſtead of εγερθη. But this reading of the Vul. though favoured by Caſ. and the Sax. tranſlation, has no ſupport of either MSS. or verſions to entitle it to regard.

31. *Herod intendeth to kill thee,* Ηρωδης θελει σε αποκτειναι. E. T. *Herod will kill thee.* But if this laſt declaration in Eng. were to be turned into Gr. the proper verſion would be, not what is ſaid by L. but Ηρωδης σε αποκτενει. The term *will* in Eng. ſo ſituated, is a mere ſign of the future, and declares no more than that the event will take place. This is not what is declared by the evangeliſt. His expreſſion denotes that, at every time, it was Herod's purpoſe to kill him; for the θελει here is the principal verb; the *will* in the tranſlation is no more than an auxiliary. Nay, the two propoſitions (though to a ſuperficial view they appear coincident) are in reality ſo different, that the one may be true and the other falſe. Suppoſe that, inſtead of Herod, Pilate had been the perſon ſpoken of. In that caſe, to have ſaid in Gr. Πιλατος θελει σε αποκτειναι, would have been telling a falſehood; for the hiſtory ſhows how much his inclination drew the contrary way: whereas, to have ſaid Πιλατος σε αποκτενει would have been affirming no more than the event verified, and might, therefore, have been accounted prophetical. Mt. xvi. 24. N. J. vii. 17. N.

CHAP. XIV.

1. *Of one of the rulers who was a Phariſee,* τινος των αρχοντων των Φαρισαιων. E. T. *Of one of the chief Phariſees.* I agree with Gro. Ham. Wh. Pearce, and others, that αρχοντες properly denotes perſons in authority, rulers, magiſtrates; and that any other kind of eminence or ſuperiority would have been diſtinguiſhed by the term πρωτοι, as in ch. xix. 47. Mr. vi. 21. Acts xiii. 50. xvii. 4. xxv. 2. xxviii. 17.

5. *If his aſs or his ox,* ονος η βους. Both the Sy. interpreters have read here υιος, *ſon*, inſtead of ονος, *aſs*, and ſo have ſome of the Fathers. The number and value of the MSS. which preſerve this reading, are very conſiderable; and though it is not found in any ancient verſion but the Sy. yet, if we were to be determined ſolely by the external evidence, I ſhould not heſitate to declare that the balance is in its favour. There is, however, an internal improbability in ſome things, which very ſtrong outward evidence cannot ſurmount. The preſent caſe is an example; and, therefore, though this reading has been admitted by Wet. and ſome other critics, I cannot help rejecting it, as, upon the whole, exceedingly improbable. My reaſons are theſe: Firſt, nothing is more common in Scripture ſtyle, wherever propriety admits it, than joining in this manner *the ox* and *the aſs*, which were in Judea almoſt the only beaſts in common uſe for work. In the O. T. it occurs very frequently. We find it in the tenth commandment, as recorded in Exod. xx. and both in the fourth and in the tenth, as repeated in Deut. v. When a caſe like the preſent is ſuppoſed, of *falling into a pit*, Exod. xxi. 33. both are, as uſual, ſpecified. *If a man ſhall dig a pit, and not cover it, and an ox or an aſs fall therein*—. That this was alſo conformable to our Lord's manner, we may ſee from the preceding chapter, v. 15. *Who is there amongſt you that doth not, on the Sabbath, looſe his ox or his aſs from the ſtall, and lead him away to watering?* Secondly, Such a combination, as that of *the aſs* and *the ox*, is not more familiar and more natural, than the other, of a man's *ſon* and his *ox*, is unnatural and unprecedented. Things thus familiarly coupled in diſcourſe, are commonly things homogeneal, or of natures, at leaſt, not very diſſimilar. Such, are *the ſon and the daughter, the man ſervant and the maid-ſervant, the ox and the aſs.* Thirdly, In thoſe ſpecimens which our Lord has given of confuting the Phariſees, by retorting on them their own practice, the argument is always of that kind which logicians call *à fortiori.* This circumſtance is ſometimes taken

notice of in the application of the argument, and even when it is not expreſsly pointed out, it is plain enough from the ſenſe. See ch. xiii. 15, 16. xv. 2, 3, 4. 8, 9. Mt. xii. 11, 12. But if the word here be *ſon*, this method is reverſed, and the argument loſes all its energy. A man, poſſeſſed of even the Phariſaical notions concerning the Sabbath, might think it, in the caſe ſuppoſed, excuſable from natural affection, or even juſtifiable from paternal duty, to give the neceſſary aid to a child in danger of periſhing, and, at the ſame time, think it inexcuſable to tranſgreſs the commandment for one to whom he is under no ſuch obligations. Fourthly, When the nature of the thing, and the ſcope of the place, render it credible that a particular reading is erroneous, the facility of falling into ſuch an error adds greatly to the credibility. Now υιος and ετος, in writing, have ſo much reſemblance, that we cannot wonder that a haſty tranſcriber ſhould have miſtaken one for the other. If the miſtake has been very early, the number of copies now affected by it would be the greater. It is too mechanical a mode of criticizing, to be determined by outward circumſtances alone, and to pay no regard to thoſe internal probabilities, of which every one who reflects muſt feel the importance.

15. *Who ſhall feaſt*, ος φαγεται αρτον. E. T. *Who ſhall eat bread. To eat bread* is a well-known Heb. idiom for to ſhare in a repaſt, whether it be at a common meal, or at a ſumptuous feaſt. The word *bread* is not underſtood as ſuggeſting either the ſcantineſs or the meanneſs of the fare.

20. *In the reign*, εν τη βασιλεια. E. T. *In the kingdom.* The E. T. makes, to appearance, the word βασιλεια. here, refer ſolely to the future ſtate of the ſaints in heaven. This verſion makes it relate to thoſe who ſhould be upon the earth in the reign of the Meſſiah. My reaſons for preferring the latter are theſe: 1ſt, This way of ſpeaking of the happineſs of the Meſſiah's adminiſtration, ſuits entirely the hopes and wiſhes which ſeem to have been long entertained by the nation concerning it. (See ch. x. 23, 24. Mt. xiii. 10, 11.) 2dly, The parable which, in anſwer to the remark, was ſpoken by our Lord, is, on all hands, underſtood to repreſent the Chriſtian diſpenſation. 3dly, The obvious intention of that parable is to ſuggeſt the prejudices which, from notions of ſecular felicity and grandeur, the nation in general entertained on that ſubject; in conſequence of which prejudices, what in proſpect they fancied ſo bleſſed a period, would, when preſent, be exceedingly neglected and deſpiſed; and, in this view, nothing could be more appoſite; whereas, there appears no appoſiteneſs in the parable on the other interpretation.

23. *Compel people to come*, αναγκασον εισελθειν. Ch. xxiv. 29. N.

26. *Hate not his father*, ου μισει τον πατερα εαυτου. It is very plain, that *hating*, uſed in this manner, was, among the Hebrews, an idiomatic expreſſion for *loving leſs*. It is the ſame ſentiment which, in Mt.'s Goſpel, x. 37. is conveyed in theſe words, *He who loveth father or mother more than me*—. In the ſtrict acceptation of the term, the doctrine of Chriſt does not permit us to hate any one, not even an enemy, much leſs a parent, to whom it exacts a more ſubſtantial honour than the traditional ſyſtem of the ſcribes repreſented as neceſſary. The things here enumerated, particularly what finiſhes the liſt, of which I am to ſpeak immediately, ſhow evidently that the language is figurative.

27. *Nay, and himſelf too*, ετι δε και την εαυτου ψυχην. E. T. *Yea, and his own life alſo.* Vul. *Adhuc etiam et animam ſuam.* Caſ. *Atque adeo ſuam ipſius animam*, which he explains on the margin, *ſemetipſum.* Dio. renders it *anzi anchora ſe ſteſſo.* The reaſons for which I have preferred this laſt manner are the following: Firſt, ψυχη is generally uſed in the Helleniſtic idiom as correſponding to the Heb. נפש *nepheſh*, *ſoul* or *life*. Now it is well known, that this word, with the affix, is frequently uſed in Heb. for the reciprocal pronoun. Thus נפשי *naphſhi*, commonly rendered in the Sep. ὁ ψυχη μου, is *myſelf*, נפשך *naphſhecha*, ὁ ψυχη σου, *thyſelf*, and ſo of the reſt. See Lev. xi. 43. Eſth. iv. 13. Pſ. cxxxi. 2. Now as there runs through the whole of this verſe in L. an implicit compariſon, to preſerve an uniformity in the manner of naming the particulars, ſhews better the preference which our Lord claims in our hearts, not only to our neareſt relatives, but alſo to ourſelves. Secondly, I have avoided the phraſe *hating his life*, as ambiguous, and often uſed, not improperly, of thoſe who deſtroy themſelves. Now the diſpoſition which our Lord here requires of his diſciples, is exceedingly different from that of thoſe perſons. For the like reaſon, I have not ſaid *hate his own ſoul*, though what many would account the moſt literal verſion of them all. For this expreſſion is alſo uſed ſometimes (ſee Prov. xxix. 24.) in a ſenſe quite different from the preſent. Thirdly, I prefer here this ſtrong manner of exhibiting the ſentiment, as, in ſuch caſes, whatever ſhows moſt clearly that the words cannot be literally underſtood, ſerves moſt effectually to ſuggeſt the figurative and true interpretation. Now as, in the common acceptation, to hate one's parents would be impious, the Apoſtle Paul tells us, Eph. v. 29. that to hate one's ſelf is impoſſible. It is not in this acceptation then that we can look for the meaning.

CHAP. XV.

1. The Vul. the Sy. and the Sax. have no word anſwering to *all* in this ſentence.

16. *He was fain*, επεθυμει. Ch. xvi. 21. N.

20. *With the huſks*, απο των κερατιων. Vul. *De ſiliquis.* That κερατιον anſwers to *ſiliqua*, and ſignifies *a huſk*, or pod, wherein the ſeeds of ſome plants, eſpecially thoſe

thoſe of the leguminous tribe, are contained, is evident. But both the Gr. κερατιον and the La. *ſiliqua* ſignify alſo the fruit of the carob-tree, a tree very common in the Levant, and in the ſouthern parts of Europe, as Spain and Italy. The Sy. and Ara. words are of the ſame import. This fruit ſtill continues to be uſed for the ſame purpoſe, the feeding of ſwine. It is alſo called *St. John's bread*, from the opinion that the Baptiſt uſed it in the wilderneſs. It is the pod only that is eaten, which ſhows the propriety of the names κερατιον and *ſiliqua*, and of rendering it into Eng. *huſk*. Miller ſays, it is mealy, and has a ſweetiſh taſte, and that it is eaten by the poorer ſort, for it grows in the common hedges, and is of little account.

18. *Againſt heaven*, that is, *againſt God*. Diſſ. V. P. I. § 4.

22. *Bring hither the principal robe*, εξενεγκατε την στολην την πρωτην. Vul. *Cito proferte ſtolam primam*. Ταχεως is found in the Cam. and one other of ſmall note. The ſecond Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. verſions have alſo read ſo.

CHAP. XVI.

8. *Commended the prudence of the unjuſt ſteward*, επηνεσε τον οικονομον της αδικιας, ὁτι φρονιμως επεποιησε. E. T. *Commended the unjuſt ſteward, becauſe he had done wiſely*. When an active verb has for its ſubject a quality, diſpoſition, or action, of a perſon, it is a common Heb. idiom to mention the perſon, as that which is directly affected by the verb, and to introduce the other (as we ſee done here) by a conjunction,—*commended the unjuſt ſteward, becauſe he had acted prudently*, that is, *commended the prudence which he had ſhown in his action*. Properly his maſter commended neither the actor nor the action, but ſolely the provident care about his future intereſt, which the action diſplayed; *a care* worthy of the imitation of thoſe who have in view a nobler futurity, eternal life.

2. Τον οικονομον της αδικιας for τον αδικον, in like manner as ὁ κριτης της αδικιας, ch. xviii. 6. for ὁ αδικος, *the unjuſt judge*.

3. *In conducting their affairs*, εις την γενεαν την ἑαυτων. E. T. *In their generation*. Γενεα is the word by which the Seventy commonly render the Heb. דור *dor*, which ſignifies not only age, *ſeculum*, and generation, or the people of the age, but alſo a man's manner of life. Thus Noah is ſaid, Gen. vi. 9. το be τελειος εν τη γενεα αυτου. Houbigant renders it *integer in viis ſuis*. It is true he conjectures very unneceſſarily a different reading. Yet he himſelf, in another place, admits this as one meaning of the Heb. word דור *dor*. Thus If. liii. 8. the words rendered in the Sep. την γενεαν αυτου τις διηγησεται, he tranſlates *ejus omnem vitam quis ſecum reputabit?* and in the notes defends this tranſlation of the Heb. דור *dor*. To the ſame purpoſe biſhop Lowth, in his late verſion of that prophet, *His manner of life who would declare?*

9. *With the deceitful mammon*, εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας. E. T. *Of the mammon of unrighteouſneſs*. Here again the ſubſtantive is employed by the ſame Hebraiſm, as in the preceding verſe, to ſupply the place of the adjective, μαμωνα της αδικιας, as οικονομον της αδικιας. The epithet *unrighteous*, here applied to mammon or riches, does not imply acquired by injuſtice or any undue means; but, in this application, it denotes *falſe* riches, that is, *deceitful*, not to be relied on. What puts this beyond a queſtion is, that, in v. 11. τω αδικω μαμωνα is contraſted, not by το δικαιον, but by το αληθινον, the former relating to *earthly* treaſure, the latter to *heavenly*. For the import of mammon, ſee Mt. vi. 24. N.

1. *After your diſcharge*, ὁταν εκλιπητε. E. T. *When ye fail*. As this is ſpoken in the application of the parable, it is to be underſtood as referring to that circumſtance which muſt ſooner or later happen to all, and which bears ſome analogy to the ſteward's diſmiſſion from his office. This circumſtance is *death*, by which we are totally diſcharged from our employment and probation here. The word *fail*, in the common verſion, is obſcure and indefinite. I have preferred *diſcharge*, as both adapted to the expreſſion of the Evangeliſt, and ſufficiently explicit. It bears a manifeſt reference to the act whereby a truſtee is diveſted of his truſt, and is alſo ſtrictly applicable to our removal out of this world. Caſ. has happily preſerved this double alluſion in La. by ſaying, *Quum defuncti fueritis*. L. Cl. has not been ſo fortunate in Fr.; he ſays, *Quand vous ſerez expirez*. The verb here ſhows clearly the future event pointed to, but detaches it altogether from the ſtory; for the word *expirez* cannot be applied to the diſcarding of a ſteward from his office. Of ſo much uſe in interpreting do we ſometimes find words which are, in a certain degree, equivocal.

3. *Into the eternal manſions*, εις τας αιωνιους σκηνας. E. T. *Into everlaſting habitations*. As σκηνη properly ſignifies *a tent* or *tabernacle*, which is a temporary and moveable habitation, ſome have thought it not ſo fitly joined here with the epithet αιωνιος. It is true that, in ſtrictneſs, σκηνη means no more than *a tent*; but it is alſo true, that ſometimes it is uſed with greater latitude, for *a dwelling* of any kind, without regard either to its nature or to its duration. The article has been very improperly, in this paſſage, overlooked by our tranſlators. It adds to the preciſion, and conſequently to the perſpicuity, of the application. J. i. 14. 2. N.

16. *Every occupant entereth it by force*, πας εις αυτην βιαζεται. E. T. *Every man preſſeth into it*. Though this laſt interpretation may be accounted more literal than that here given, it is farther from the import of the ſentence. The intention is manifeſtly to in-

form

form us, not how great the number was of thoſe who entered into the kingdom of God, but what the manner was in which all who entered obtained admiſſion. The import, therefore, is only, *Every one who entereth it, entereth it by force.* We know, that during our Lord's miniſtry, which was (as John's alſo was) among the Jews; both his ſucceſs and that of the Baptiſt were comparatively ſmall. Chriſt's flock was literally, even to the laſt, ποιμνιον μικρον, *a very little flock.* Of the backwardneſs of the people, we hear frequently in the Goſpel. *He came to his own,* ſays the Apoſtle John, *but his own received him not.* And he himſelf complains, *Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life.* It was not till after *he was lifted up* upon the croſs, that, according to his own prediction, he *drew all men to him.*

21. *Was fain to feed on the crumbs,* επιθυμων, χορτασθηναι απο των ψιχιων. E. T. *Deſiring to be fed with the crumbs.* I agree with thoſe who do not think there is any foundation, in this expreſſion, for ſaying that he was refuſed the crumbs. Firſt, the word επιθυμων does not imply ſo much; ſecondly, the other circumſtances of the ſtory render this notion improbable. Firſt, as to the ſcriptural ſenſe of the word, the verb επιθυμεω is uſed by the Seventy, Iſ. i. 29. for rendering the Heb. בחר *bahar, elegit.* The clauſe is rendered, in the E. T. *For the gardens which ye have choſen.* In like manner, in Iſ. lviii. 2. the word occurs twice, anſwering to the Heb. חפץ *chaphats, to delight,* or *take pleaſure in;* γνωναι με τας οδους επιθυμουσιν; again, εγγιζειν Θεω επιθυμουσιν. E. T. *They delight to know my ways;* and, *They take delight in approaching to God.* It is not neceſſary to multiply examples. That the notion, that he did not obtain the crumbs, is not conſiſtent with the other circumſtances, is evident. When the hiſtorian ſays, that he was laid at the rich man's gate, he means not, ſurely, that he was once there, but that he was uſually ſo placed, which would not probably have happened if he had got nothing at all. The other circumſtances concur in heightening the probability. Such are, the rich man's immediately knowing him, his aſking that he might be made the inſtrument of the relief wanted; and, let me add this, that though the Patriarch upbraids the rich man with the careleſſneſs and luxury in which he had lived, he ſays not a word of inhumanity; yet, if we conſider Lazarus as having experienced it ſo recently, it could hardly, on this occaſion, have failed to be taken notice of. Can we ſuppoſe that Abraham, in the charge he brought againſt him, would have mentioned only the things of leaſt moment, and omitted thoſe of the greateſt? For ſimilar reaſons, I have rendered επιθυμει, ch. xv. 16. in the ſame manner as here. In the E. T. the expreſſion there ſuggeſts more ſtrongly, that his deſire was fruſtrated: *He would fain have filled his belly,* which, in the common idiom, always implies, *but could not.* It appears very abſurd, that one ſhould have the charge of keeping ſwine, who had it not in his power to partake with them. How could it be prevented? Would the maſter multiply his ſervants in the time of famine, and ſend one to watch and keep this keeper? The clauſe, *for nobody gave him ought,* is to be interpreted not ſtrictly, but agreeably to popular language; as though it had been ſaid, that in the general calamity he was much neglected, and if he had not had recourſe to the food allotted for the ſwine, he would have been in eminent danger of ſtarving.

22. Much injury has been done to our Saviour's inſtructions, by the ill-judged endeavours of ſome expoſitors to improve and ſtrengthen them. I know no better example for illuſtrating this remark, than the ſtory of the rich man and Lazarus. Many, diſſatisfied with its ſimplicity, as related by the Evangeliſt, and deſirous, one would think, to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of exceſſive ſeverity in the condemnation of the former, load that wretched man with all the crimes which can blacken human nature, and for which they have no authority from the words of inſpiration. They will have him to have been a glutton and a drunkard, rapacious and unjuſt, cruel and hard-hearted, one who ſpent in intemperance what he had acquired by extortion and fraud. Now, I muſt be allowed to remark that, by ſo doing, they totally pervert the deſign of this moſt inſtructive leſſon, which is to admoniſh us, not that a monſter of wickedneſs who has, as it were, devoted his life to the ſervice of Satan, ſhall be puniſhed in the other world; but that the man who, though not chargeable with doing much ill, does little or no good, and lives, though not, perhaps, an intemperate, a ſenſual life; who, careleſs about the ſituation of others, exiſts only for the gratification of himſelf, the indulgence of his own appetites, and his own vanity; ſhall not eſcape puniſhment. It is to ſhow the danger of living in the neglect of duties, though not chargeable with the commiſſion of crimes; and, particularly the danger of conſidering the gifts of Providence as our own property, and not as a truſt from our Creator, to be employed in his ſervice, and for which we are accountable to him. Theſe appear to be the reaſons for which our Lord has here ſhown the evil of a life which, ſo far from being univerſally deteſted, is, at this day but too much admired, envied, and imitated.

3. The Vul. adds, *Et nemo illi dabat;* but has no ſupport, except that of one or two inconſiderable MSS. and the Sax. verſion. This reading has, doubtleſs, by the blunder of ſome copiſt, been tranſcribed from the preceding chapter.

22. Vul. *Sepultus eſt inferno.* This reading is equally unſupported with the former, and is a mere corruption of the text, ariſing from the omiſſion of the conjunction in the beginning of verſe 23. and the miſplacing of the points.

For the illuſtration of ſeveral words in this and the following verſes, ſuch as ἐν τῷ ἅδῃ—τὸν κόλπον τὸν Ἀβραὰμ—πτύνεχθηναι—διαζωνοι—διαπερωσιν— ſee Prel. Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.

25. A great many MSS. and ſome ancient verſions, particularly the Sy. read ὧδι, *here*, inſtead of ὁδι, *but be*; and this reading is adopted by Wet. The reſemblance in ſound, as well as in writing, may eaſily account for a much greater miſtake in copying. But that the common reading is preferable, can hardly be queſtioned. In it ὁ δι, is contraſted to συ δε, as τιν is, in like manner, to ἐν ζωη σε; but to ὧδι nothing is oppoſed. Had ἐκει occurred in the other member of the compariſon made by the Patriarch, I ſhould have readily admitted that the probability was on the ſide of the Sy. verſion.

CHAP. XVII.

7. *Would any of you who hath*, &c. *ſay to him, on his return from the field, Come immediately*, τις δε ἐξ ὑμων δουλον— εισελθοντι ἐκ τῦ ἀγρῦ ἐρει ευθεως παρελθων. E. T. *Which of you having a ſervant—, will ſay unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go*— Vul. *Regreſſo de agro dicat illi, ſtatim tranſi.* The only material difference between theſe two verſions ariſes from the different manner of pointing. I have, with the Vul. joined ευθεως to παρελθων. Our tranſlators, with Be. have joined it to ἐρει. In this way of reading the ſentence, the adverb is no better than an expletive; in the other, ευθεως παρελθων is well contraſted to μετα ταυτα φαγεσαι in the following verſe.

10. *We have conferred no favour*, δουλοι ἀχρειοι ἐσμεν Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 14.

11. *Through the confines of Samaria and Galilee*, διὰ μεσου Σαμαρειας και Γαλιλαιας. E. T. *Through the midſt of Samaria and Galilee.* I agree with Gro. and others, that it was not through the heart of theſe countries, but, on the contrary, through thoſe parts in which they bordered with each other, that our Lord travelled at that time. I underſtand the words διὰ μεσου, as of the ſame import with ανα μεσον, as commonly underſtood. And in this manner we find it interpreted by the Sy. and Ara. tranſlators. No doubt the neareſt way, from where our Lord reſided, was through the midſt of Samaria. But had that been his route, the hiſtorian had no occaſion to mention Galilee, the country whence he came; and if he had mentioned it, it would have been ſurely more proper, in ſpeaking of a Journey from a Galilean city to Jeruſalem, to ſay, through Galilee and Samaria, than, reverſing the natural order, to ſay, through Samaria and Galilee. But if, as I underſtand it, the confines only of the two countries were meant, it is a matter of no conſequence which of them was firſt named. Beſides, the incident recorded in the following words, alſo, renders it more probable that he was on the borders of Samaria, than in the midſt of the country. It appears that there was but one Samaritan among the lepers that were cleanſed, who is called an alien, the reſt being Jews.

18. *This Alien*, ὁ ἀλλογενης ὑτος. The Jews have, ever ſince the captivity, conſidered the Samaritans as aliens. They call them *Cuthites* to this day.

21. *The reign of God is within you*, ἡ βασιλεια τ Θεȣ ἐντος ὑμων ἐστιν. Vul. Er. Zu. *Regnum Dei intra vos eſt.* Caſ. though not in the ſame words, to the ſame purpoſe. I ſhould have added Be. too, who ſays, *Regnum Dei intus habetis*; had he not ſhown, in his Commentary, that he meant differently, denoting no more, by *intus*, than *apud vos*. Moſt modern tranſlators, and, among them, the authors of our common verſion, have rendered the words in the ſame way as the Vul. the Sy. and other ancient interpreters. L. Cl. and Beau. both, ſay, *Au milieu de vous*, and have been followed by ſome Eng. tranſlators, particularly the An. and Dod. who ſay *Among you*. This way of rendering has alſo been ſtrenuouſly ſupported, of late by ſome learned critics. I ſhall briefly ſtate the evidence on both ſides. That the prepoſition ἐντος, before a plural noun, ſignifies *among*, Raphelius has given one clear example from Xenophon's Expedition of Cyrus, the only one, it would appear, that has yet been diſcovered, for to it later critics, as Dod. and Pearce, have been obliged to recur. I have taken occaſion, once and again, to declare my diſſatisfaction with concluſions founded merely on claſſical authority, in caſes where recourſe could be had to the writings of the N. T. or the ancient Gr. tranſlation of the Old. I acknowledge that ἐντος does not oft occur in either, but it does ſometimes. Yet in none of the places does it admit the ſignification which thoſe critics give it here. As I would avoid being tedious, I ſhall only point out the paſſages to the learned reader, leaving him to conſult them at his leiſure. The only other place in the N. T. is Mt. xxiii. 26. In the Sep. Pſ. xxxviii. 4. cviii. 22. or, as numbered in the Eng. Bible, xxxix. 3. cix. 22. and Cant iii. 10. Theſe are all the paſſages wherein ἐντος occurs as a prepoſition in that verſion. But it is ſometimes uſed elliptically with the article τα, for the inſide, or the things within, as Pſ. cii. 1. in the Gr. but in the Eng. ciii. 1. Iſ. xvi. 11. Dan. x. 16. We have this expreſſion alſo twice in the Apocrypha, Eccluſ xix. 26. 1 Mac. iv. 48. Of all which I ſhall only remark, in general, that no advocate for the modern interpretation of ἐντος ὑμων in the Goſpel, has produced any one of them as giving countenance to his opinion. Wh. (who, though a judicious critic, ſometimes argues more like a party than a judge), after explaining ἐντος ὑμων ἐστιν to mean, *is even now among you*, and *is come unto you*; adds, "ſo "ἐντος ὑμων, and ἐν ὑμιν, are frequently uſed in the "O. T." Now, the truth is, that ἐν ὑμιν does frequently occur in the O. T. in the acceptation mentioned, but ἐντος ὑμων never, either in that or in any other acceptation: nor does ἐντος ὑμων occur, nor ἐντος

αυτων, nor any ſimilar expreſſion. The author proceeds to give examples: accordingly, his examples are all (as was unavoidable, for he had no other) of εν ὑμιν, and εν ἡμιν, not one of ἐντος ὑμων, or of any ſimilar application of this prepoſition. Strange, indeed, if he did not perceive that a ſingle example of this uſe of the prepoſition ἐντος (which uſe he had affirmed to be frequent), was more to his purpoſe than five hundred examples of the other. The inſtances of the other were, indeed, nothing to his purpoſe at all. The import of εν, in ſuch caſes, was never queſtioned; and his proceeding, on the ſuppoſition, that thoſe phraſes were equivalent, was what logicians call a *petitio principii*, a taking for granted the whole matter in diſpute. Nay, let me add, that the frequency of the occurrence of εν ὑμιν, in Scripture, applied to a purpoſe to which ἐντος ὑμων is never applied, notwithſtanding the numerous occaſions, makes againſt his argument, inſtead of ſupporting it, as it renders it very improbable that the two phraſes were underſtood as equivalent.—But to come from the external, to the internal, evidence; it has been thought, that the interpretation, *amongſt you*, ſuits better the circumſtances of the times. The Meſſiah was already come. His doctrine was begun to be preached, and converts, though not very numerous, were made. This may be regarded as evidences that his reign was already commenced among them. But in what ſenſe, it may be aſked, could his reign or kingdom be ſaid to be within them? It is true, that the laws of the kingdom were intended for regulating the inward principles of the heart, as well as the outward actions of the life; but is it not rather too great a ſtretch in language, to talk of God's kingdom being within us? So, I acknowledge, I thought once; but on conſidering the great latitude wherein the phraſe, ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου, is uſed in the N. T. in relation ſometimes to the epoch of the diſpenſation, ſometimes to the place, ſometimes for the divine adminiſtration itſelf, ſometimes for the laws and maxims which would obtain; I began to think differently of the uſe of the word in this paſſage. The Apoſtle Paul hath ſaid, Rom. xiv. 17. *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteouſneſs, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghoſt.* Now, theſe qualities, *righteouſneſs, and peace, and ſpiritual joy*, if we have them at all, muſt be *within us*, that is, in the heart or ſoul. If ſo, the Apoſtle has, by implication, ſaid no leſs than is reported here by the Evangeliſt, as having been ſaid by our Lord, that the kingdom of God is *within us*. Is there any impropriety in ſaying that God reigns in the hearts of his people? If not, to ſay, *the reign of God is in their hearts*, or *within them*, is the ſame thing, a little varied in the form of expreſſion. Even the rendering of βασιλεια, *kingdom*, and not *reign*, heightens the apparent impropriety. But it is a more formidable objection againſt the common verſion, that our Lord's diſcourſe was at that time addreſſed to the Phariſees: and how could it be ſaid to men, whoſe hearts were ſo alienated from God, as theirs then were, that God reigned within them? This difficulty ſeems to have determined the opinion of Dr. Dod. To this I anſwer, that in ſuch declarations, conveying general truths, the perſonal pronoun is not to be ſtrictly interpreted. It is not, in ſuch caſes, *you* the individuals ſpoken to, but you of this nation, or you of the human ſpecies, men in general. In this way we underſtand the words of Moſes, Deut. xxx. 11, 12, 13, 14. *This commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou ſhouldſt ſay, Who ſhall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Nor is it beyond the ſea, that thou ſhouldſt ſay, Who ſhall go over the ſea for us, and bring it unto us that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayeſt do it.* This not to be conſidered as characteriſing any individual (for let it be obſerved, that the pronoun is, throughout the whole, in the ſingular number), nor even the whole people addreſſed. The people addreſſed had, by their conduct, ſhown too often, and too plainly, that the commandments of God were neither in their heart nor in their mouth. But it is to be conſidered as explaining the nature of the divine ſervice; for it remains an unchangeable truth, that it is an eſſential character of the ſervice which God requires from his people, that his word be habitually in their heart. The ſame ſentiment is quoted by the Apoſtle, Rom. x. 6, &c. and adapted to the Goſpel diſpenſation.

36. The whole of this verſe is wanting in many MSS. ſome of them of great note. It is not found in ſome of the early editions, nor in the Cop. and Eth. verſions. But both the Sy. verſions, alſo the Ara. and the Vul. have it. In a number of La. MSS. it is wanting. Some critics ſuppoſe it to have been added from Mt. This is not improbable. However, as the evidence on both ſides nearly balances each other, I have retained it in the text, diſtinguiſhing it as of doubtful authority.

CHAP. XVIII.

1. *He alſo ſhowed them by a parable that they ought to perſiſt in prayer*, ελεγε δε και παραβολην, αυτοις προς το δειν παντοτε προσευχεσθαι. E. T. *And he ſpake a parable unto them, to this end, that men ought always to pray.* The conſtruction here plainly ſhows, that the word to be ſupplied before the infinitive is αυτους. Ελεγεν αυτοις—προς το δειν αυτους. The words are a continuation of the diſcourſe related in the preceding chapter, which is here rather inopportunely interrupted by the diviſion into chapters. There is, in theſe words, and in the following parable, a particular reference to the diſtreſs and trouble they were ſoon to meet with from their perſecutors, which would render the duties of prayer, patience, and perſeverance, peculiarly ſeaſonable.

3. *De*

3. *Do me juſtice on my adverſary*, εκδικησον με απο του αντιδικου μου. E. T. *Avenge me of mine adverſary.* The Eng. verb *to avenge*, denotes either *to revenge* or *to puniſh*; the laſt eſpecially, when God is ſpoken of as the avenger. The Gr. verb εκδικεω ſignifies alſo to *judge a cauſe*, and to defend the injured judicially from the injurious perſon. The word *avenge*, therefore, does not exactly hit the ſenſe of the original in v. 3. although, in the application of the parable, v. 7. it anſwers better than any other term. The literal ſenſe is ſo manifeſt, and the connection in the things ſpoken of is ſo cloſe, that the change of the word in tranſlating does not hurt perſpicuity.

7. *Will he linger in their cauſe?* και μακροθυμων επ' αυτοις. E. T. *Though he bear long with them.* Vul. *Et patientiam habebit in illis?* Er. *Etiam cum patiens fuerit ſuper illis.* Zu. *Etiamſi longa patientia utatur ſuper illis.* Caſ. *Et tam erit in eos difficilis?* Be. *Etiamſi iram differat ſuper ipſis.* So various are the ways of interpreting this ſhort clauſe. Let it be obſerved that both the Al. and the Cam. MSS. read μακροθυμει. The Vul. and even the Sy. appear to me to have read in the ſame manner; ſo alſo have ſome of the Fathers. But the verſion given here does not depend on that reading. The omiſſion of the ſubſtantive verb, connected with the participle, is common in the Oriental idiom. I therefore underſtand μακροθυμων here as put for μακροθυμων εστι, and conſequently equivalent to μακροθυμει. As μακροθυμειν commonly denotes to have patience, and as it ſometimes happens that patient people appear ſlow in their proceedings, it comes, by an eaſy tranſition, to ſignify *to linger*, *to delay*. In this ſenſe I underſtand it here with Gro. reading this member of the ſentence, as well as the preceding with an interrogation. The words quoted by him from the ſon of Sirach, Ecclus xxxii. 18. in the Gr. but in the E. T. which follows the Com. and the Vul. xxxv. 18. appear both perſpicuous and deciſive, ὁ κυριος ου μη βραδυνη, ουδ μη μακροθυμησει επ' αυτοις. The firſt clauſe is juſtly interpreted in the E. T. *the Lord will not be ſlack*; but the ſecond is rendered, both obſcurely and inaccurately, *neither will the mighty be patient towards them.* Properly thus, *neither will he linger in their cauſe.* The pronoun *their* refers to the humble mentioned in the preceding verſe, whoſe prayer pierceth the clouds. To me it appears very probable, conſidering the affinity of the ſubject, that the Evangeliſt had, in the expreſſion he employed, an alluſion to the words of the Jewiſh ſage.

8. *Will he find this belief in the land?* αρα ευρησει την πιστιν επι της γης; E. T. *Shall he find faith on the earth?* There is a cloſe connection in all that our Lord ſays on any topic of converſation, which rarely eſcapes an attentive reader. If in this, as is very probable, he refers to the deſtruction impending over the Jewiſh nation, as the judgment of heaven for their rebellion againſt God, in rejecting and murdering the Meſſiah, and in perſecuting his adherents, την πιστιν muſt be underſtood to mean *this belief*, or the belief of the particular truth he had been inculcating, namely, that God will, in due time, avenge his elect, and ſignally puniſh their oppreſſors; and την γην muſt mean *the land*, to wit, Judea. The words may be tranſlated either way; but the latter evidently gives them a more definite meaning, and unites them more cloſely with thoſe which preceded.

9. *Example*, παραβολην. Mt. xiii. 3. N.

11. *The Phariſee, ſtanding by himſelf prayed thus*, ὁ Φαρισαιος σταθεις προς εαυτον ταυτα προσηυχετο. E. T. *The Phariſee ſtood and prayed thus with himſelf.* Our tranſlators have conſidered the words προς εαυτον as connected with προσηυχετο, in which caſe they are a mere pleonaſm. I have preferred the manner of Dod. and others, who join them to σταθεις; for in this way they are characteriſtical of the ſect, who always affected to dread pollution from the touch of thoſe whom they conſidered as their inferiors in piety.

25. *Paſs through* διελθειν. Vul. *Tranſire.* I have here, with the Eng. tranſlators, preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The MSS. however, are not unanimous. The Al. Cam. and a few others, read διελθειν. Agreeable to this is the verſion, not only of the Vul. but of the Go. Sax. ſecond Sy. and Eth. Mt. xix. 24. N.

35. *When he came near Jericho*, εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις Ιεριχω. L. Cl. and Beau. *Comme il cioit prés de Jericho.* This manner is likewiſe adopted by moſt of the late Eng. tranſlators. What recommends it is the conſideration that thereby an apparent contradiction in the Evangeliſts is avoided; Mt. and Mr. having mentioned, this miracle, as performed by our Lord, after he left Jericho. Gro. has remarked, that εγγιζειν means *to be near*, as well as *to come near*, which is true. But it is not leſs true, that, in this acceptation, it is conſtrued with the dative. When followed by the prepoſition εις, it always denotes, if I miſtake not, to approach. A moſt extraordinary ſolution is given from Markland [Boyer's Conjectures], who ſuppoſes an ellipſis, which he ſupplies thus, εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις [*ſupple* Ιεροσολυμα εις] Ιεριχω. If ſo, the tranſlation here given is unexceptionable; for the ellipſis is juſt as eaſily ſupplied in Eng. as in Gr. *When they came near* [meaning *Jeruſalem*, being at] *Jericho.* A liberty ſo unbounded is not more agreeable to the Gr. idiom than to the Eng. It is alike repugnant to the idiom of every tongue, to authoriſe an interpreter to make a writer ſay what he pleaſes. Such licenſes are ſubverſive of all grammar and ſyntax.

CHAP. XIX.

2. *And chief of the publicans*, και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης. E. T. *Which was the chief among the publicans.* This ſeems

ſeems to imply, that he was the chief of the whole order in Paleſtine. Had this been the caſe, the name would have, moſt probably, been attended with the article. Thus it is always ſaid ὁ αρχιερευς when *the high prieſt* is ſpoken of. In like manner, when there is in the nation but one of any particular office or dignity, as ὁ βασιλευς, *the king*, ὁ ηγεμων, *the procurator*, ὁ ανθυπατος, *the proconſul*. To have tranſlated the word a chief publican, would have been, on the contrary, ſaying too little. This expreſſion does not neceſſarily imply authority, or even that there were not, in the ſame place, ſome on a footing with him. Now, if the Evangeliſt had meant to ſay no more than this, I think his expreſſion would have been εις των αρχιτελωνων, as we find, in the ſame way, εις των αρχισυναγωγων uſed, Mr. v. 22. Whereas, the manner in which L. mentions the circumſtance of office here, και ουτος ην αρχιτελωνης, ſeems to ſhow that, in the ſtation he poſſeſſed, he was ſingle in that place, and conſequently that he was chief of the publicans of the city or diſtrict; for, let it be obſerved, that though the Gr. article renders the noun to which it is prefixed perfectly definite, the want of it does not render a noun ſo deciſively indefinite, as the indefinite article does in modern languages.

8. *If in aught I have wronged any man*, ει τινος τι εσυκοφαντησα. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 16.

9. *Jeſus ſaid concerning him*, ειπε προς αυτον ὁ Ιησους. E. T. *Jeſus ſaid unto him*. The thing ſaid ſhows clearly, that our Lord ſpoke, not to Zaccheus, but to the people concerning Zaccheus. He is mentioned in the third perſon, καθοτι και αυτος, *inaſmuch as he alſo*. Of this mode of expreſſion we have another example in the very next chapter, v. 19. εγνωσαν ὁτι προς αυτους την παραβολην ταυτην ειπε E. T. *They perceived that he had ſpoken this parable againſt them*. It is from the import of the parable itſelf that προς αυτους is rendered *againſt them*; for, had it been in their favour, there would have been no impropriety in ſaying προς αυτους to denote *concerning them*, or in relation to them. Another example we have, Heb. i. 7. προς μεν τους αγγελους λεγει. E. T. *Of the angels he ſaith*.

12. *To procure for himſelf royalty*, λαβειν εαυτω βασιλειαν. E. T. *To receive for himſelf a kingdom*. To me it is manifeſt that βασιλεια here ſignifies *royalty*, that is, royal power and dignity. For that it was not a different kingdom from that wherein he lived, as the common verſion implies, is evident from v. 14. It is equally ſo, that there is in this circumſtance an alluſion to what was well known to his hearers, the way in which Archelaus, and even Herod himſelf, had obtained their rank and authority in Judea, by favour of the Romans. When this reference to the hiſtory of the times is kept in view, and βασιλεια underſtood to denote *royal power* and dignity, there is not the ſhadow of a difficulty in the ſtory. In any other explanation, the expounder, in order to remove inconſiſtencies, is obliged to ſuppoſe ſo many circumſtances not related, or even hinted, by the Evangeliſt, that the latter is, to ſay the leaſt, made appear a very inaccurate narrator. The great latitude in which the word βασιλεια is uſed in the Goſpel, will appear from ſeveral conſiderations, particularly from its being employed in uſhering in a great number of our Lord's parables, wherein the ſubjects illuſtrated are very different from one another. Diſſ. V. P. I. § 7.

13. *Having called ten of his ſervants*, καλεσας δε δεκα δουλους εαυτου. E. T. *He called his ten ſervants*. This implies that he had neither more nor fewer than *ten ſervants*, who were all called. Had this been our Lord's meaning, the expreſſion muſt have been καλεσας δε τους δεκας εαυτου.

13. *Pounds*. Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 7.

32. *Found every thing as he had told them*, ευρον καθως ειπεν αυτοις. Vul. *Invenerunt, ſicut dixit illis ſtantem pullum*. Agreeably to this a few MSS. but none of any note, read after αυτοις, εσωτα του πωλον. The ſecond Sy. the Sax. and the Arm. verſions are alſo conformable to the Vul.

42. *Oh that thou hadſt conſidered*, ὁτι ει εγνως και συ, Ch. xii. 49. N.

43. *Will ſurround thee with a rampart*, περιβαλουσι χαρακα σοι. E. T. *Shall caſt a trench about thee*. Χαραξ does not occur in any other place of the N. T.; but in ſome places wherein it occurs in the Sep. it has evidently the ſenſe I have here given it. Indeed a *rampart*, or mound of earth, was always accompanied with a trench or ditch, out of which was dug the earth neceſſary for raiſing the rampart. Some expoſitors have clearly ſhown, that this is a common meaning of the word in Gr. authors. Its perfect conformity to the account of that tranſaction, given by the Jewiſh hiſtorian, is an additional argument in its favour.

CHAP. XX.

1. *Teaching—and publiſhing the good tidings*—διδασκοντος—και ευαγγελιζομενου—. Diſſ. VI. P. V. § 14.

13. *Surely*, ισως. E. T. *It may be*. Though the latter may be thought the more common ſignification, the former ſuits better the genius of the parable, and the parallel paſſages. Beſides, the word has often that ſignification in profane authors. It is found but once in the verſion of the Seventy, 1 Sam. xxv. 21. where it is evidently uſed in this ſenſe, anſwering to the Heb. אך *ach*, *profecto*, and rendered in the E. T. *ſurely*. It occurs in no other place of the N. T.

35. *Who ſhall be honoured to ſhare in the reſurrection*. It may be remarked in paſſing, that our Lord, agreeably

agreeably to the Jewiſh ſtyle of that period, calls that only *the reſurrection*, which is is a reſurrection to glory.

CHAP. XXI.

8. *Saying, I am the perſon; and the time approacheth,* λεγοντες, ὁτι εγω ειμι· και ὁ καιρος ηγγικε. The ſecond clauſe, και ὁ καιρος ηγγικε, *and the time approacheth*, is capable of being underſtood as the words either of the falſe meſſiahs that would ariſe, or of our Lord himſelf. In the former caſe, the copulative και connects this clauſe with that immediately preceding, to wit, εγω ειμι; in the latter, the connection is made with the verb ελευσονται. Former expoſitors have, I think, in general, adopted the latter mode of interpreting, making theſe the words of our Lord. Of this number is Gro. who conſiders the ſecond clauſe as equivalent to what is ſaid, Mt. xxiv. 34. Mr. xiii. 30. *This generation ſhall not paſs till all theſe things be fulfilled.* Moſt tranſlators alſo have favoured this manner. Er. ſays, *Multi venient dicentes ſe eſſe Chriſtium; et tempus inſtat.* Had he underſtood both clauſes as the words of the impoſtors, he would have ſaid *inſtare.* Caſ. to the ſame purpoſe, *Qui ſe eum eſſe dicant; et quidem tempus inſtat.* Such foreign tranſlations as do not preſerve the ambiguity of the original, ſeem all to approve the ſame explanation. Some late Eng. commentators have favoured the other, and have been followed by ſome interpreters, Dod. and Weſ. in particular. Yet, in their tranſlations themſelves, this does not appear, unleſs from the pointing, or the notes. As very plauſible things may be ſaid on each ſide of the queſtion, and as there does not appear any thing in the context, that can be accounted deciſive, I conſider this as one of thoſe ambiguities which tranſlators ought, if poſſible, to preſerve. Moſt of them, indeed, have either accidentally or intentionally done ſo. Of this number is the Vul. *Dicentes quia ego ſum, et tempus appropinquavit.* And the Zu. *Dicentes, Ego ſum Chriſtus, et tempus inſtat.* As alſo the E. T. *Saying, I am Chriſt, and the time draweth near.* Biſhop Pearce ſeems to think that the words in the following verſe, και ευθεως το τελος, are ſaid in direct contradiction to the clauſe, ὁ καιρος ηγγικε, and, conſequently, ſhow this to be the aſſertion of the ſeducers. If our Lord had employed ὁ καιρος in this verſe, inſtead of το τελος, I ſhould have thought the argument very ſtrong; but, as it ſtands, it has no weight at all. I know no interpreter who gives the ſame import to καιρος, in the eighth verſe, and to τελος, in the ninth. And if they refer to different events, the one cannot be in oppoſition to the other.

19. *Save yourſelves by your perſeverance,* εν τη ὑπομονη ὑμων κτησασθε τας ψυχας ὑμων. E. T. *In your patience poſſeſs ye your ſouls.* For the proper import of the word ὑπομονη, ſee ch. viii. 15. N. κταομαι ſignifies not only *I poſſeſs*, but *I acquire*, and even *I preſerve* what I have acquired; for it is only thus I continue to poſſeſs it. Such phraſes as αι ψυχαι ὑμων were ſhown, ch. xiv. 26. N. to ſerve, in the Helleniſtic idiom, for the reciprocal pronoun. The ſentence is, therefore, but another manner of expreſſing the ſame ſenſe, which Mt. has delivered (ch. x. 22.) in theſe words—*The man who perſevereth to the end, ſhall be ſaved,* ὁ ὑπομεινας εις τελος, ὁυτος σωθησεται. That the words may have a relation to a temporal, as well as to eternal, ſalvation, is not to be doubted; but as the whole diſcourſe is a prophecy, a tranſlator ought not, from the lights afforded by the fulfilment, to attempt rendering it more explicit than it muſt have appeared to the hearers at the time. I ſhall only add, in paſſing, that there is a ſmall deviation from the common, in the reading of the Vul. and the Sy. verſions, where we find the future of the indicative inſtead of the imperative; in conformity to which, three or four MSS. have κτησεσθε inſtead of κτησασθε. But this makes no alteration on the ſenſe. It may be even reaſonably queſtioned, whether there has been any difference in the Gr. copies uſed by thoſe tranſlators. The future in Heb. is often no other than a more ſolemn expreſſion of the imperative: and, therefore, if I had not had occaſion to make other remarks on the verſe, I ſhould have thought this too ſlight a difference to be taken notice of here.

21. *Let thoſe in the city make their eſcape,* οι εν μεσω αυτης εκχωρειτωσαν. E. T. *Let them which are in the midſt of it depart out.* Αυτης may here, very naturally, be thought at firſt to refer to Ιουδαια, mentioned in the former part of the verſe. But the ſenſe and connection evidently ſhow, that it relates to Ιερουσαλημ, mentioned in the foregoing verſe. The next member of the ſentence is a confirmation of this—και οι εν ταις χωραις, μη εισερχεσθωσαν εις αυτην. Here the fields could not be contraſted to Judea, the country of which they were a part, but are very properly contraſted to Jeruſalem, the metropolis; the contraſt of *town* and *country* is familiar in every language. I do not urge that this ſuits better the events which ſoon followed: for if there were not ground for this interpretation from the context and the parallel paſſages in the other Goſpels, it would be hazardous to determine what the inſpired author has ſaid, from what a tranſlator may fancy he ought to have ſaid, that the prediction might tally with the accompliſhment. In this way of expounding, too much ſcope is given to imagination, perhaps to rooted prejudices and mere partiality.

23. *Wo unto the women with child.* Ch. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

25. *Upon the earth,* επι της γης. Some late expoſitors think it ought to be rendered, *upon the land*, conſidering the prophecy as relating ſolely to Judea. The words, as they ſtand, may, no doubt, be tranſlated either way. I have preferred that of the common verſion, for the following reaſons: Firſt, though

what preceded ſeems peculiarly to concern the Jews, what follows appears to have a more extenſive object, and to relate to the nations, and the habitable earth in general. There we hear of συνοχη εθνων, and of the things επερχομενων τη οικουμενη; not to mention what immediately follows, to wit, that the ſon of man ſhall be ſeen coming on a cloud, with great glory and power. Nor is it at all probable that, by the term εθνων, *nations*, uſed thrice in the preceding verſe, manifeſtly for *Gentiles*, are meant in this verſe only Jews and Samaritans. Secondly, the prediction which the verſe under examination introduces, is accurately diſtinguiſhed by the hiſtorian, as not commencing till after the completion of the former. It was not till after the calamities which were to befal the Jews, ſhould be ended; after their capital and temple, their laſt reſource, ſhould be inveſted and taken, and the wretched inhabitants deſtroyed, or carried captive into all nations; after Jeruſalem ſhould be trodden by the Gentiles; nay, and after the triumph of the Gentiles ſhould be brought to a period; that the prophecy contained in this and the two ſubſequent verſes, ſhould begin to take effect. The judicious reader, to be convinced of this, needs only give the paſſage an attentive peruſal.

30. *When ye obſerve them ſhooting forth,* οταν προβαλωσιν ηδη, βλεποντες. Vul. *Cum producunt jam ex ſe fructum.* This addition of *fructum* is not favoured by any other verſion except the Sax. or even by any MS. except the Cam. which has τον καρπον αυτων.

CHAP. XXII.

25. *They who oppreſs them are ſtyled benefactors,* οι εξουσιαζοντες αυτων ευεργεται καλουνται. E. T. *They that exerciſe authority upon them are called benefactors.* The verb εξουσιαζω, in its common acceptation, does not mean ſimply *to rule*, or govern, as ποιμαινω, αρχω, ηγεμονευω, or κυβερναω, but *to rule with rigour* and oppreſſion, as a deſpot rules his ſlaves. It is in this ſenſe uſed by the Apoſtle Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 12. ουκ εγω εξουσιασθησομαι υπο τινος. E. T. *I will not be brought under the power of any*; that is, 'How indifferent 'ſoever in themſelves the particular gratifications may 'be;' for it is of this kind of ſpiritual ſubjection he is ſpeaking, 'I will not allow myſelf to be enſlaved by 'any appetite.' It ſeems to be our Lord's view, in theſe inſtructions, not only to check, in his Apoſtles, all ambition of power, every thing which favoured of a deſire of ſuperiority and dominion over their brethren, but alſo to reſtrain that ſpecies of vanity which is near akin to it, the affectation of diſtinction from titles of reſpect and dignity. Againſt this vice particularly, the clauſe under conſideration ſeems to be levelled. The reflection naturally ſuggeſted by it is, How little are any the moſt pompous epithets which men can beſtow, worthy the regard of a good man, who obſerves how vilely, through ſervility and flattery, they are ſometimes proſtituted on the moſt undeſerving. That there is an alluſion to the titles much affected by monarchs and conquerors in thoſe ages, amongſt which, *benefactor*, EUERGETES, was one, there can be little doubt. To the ſame purpoſe, are thoſe inſtructions wherein he prohibits their calling any man upon the earth their *father* or *teacher in things divine*, or aſſuming to themſelves the title of *rabbi* or *leader*.

29, 30. *And I grant unto you to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom (ſeeing my Father hath granted me a kingdom) and to ſit*—καγω διατιθεμαι υμιν, καθως διεθετο μοι ο πατηρ μου, βασιλειαν· ινα εσθητε και πινητε επι της τραπεζης μου, εν τη βασιλεια μου, και καθισησθε—. E. T. *And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and ſit*—. There is evidently an indiſtinctneſs in this verſion, which is not warranted by the original. At firſt, the grant to the diſciples appears to be ſomething very different from what it is afterwards found to be, by the explanation ſubjoined. The firſt is *a kingdom*; the ſecond, *that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.* Βασιλειαν is rendered as if it were governed by διατιθεμαι, and not as it is, both in reality, and to appearance, by διεθετο. Make but a ſmall alteration in the pointing, which is entirely of the juriſdiction of criticiſm, remove the comma after μου, and place it after βασιλειαν, and nothing can be clearer or more explicit than the ſentence. I have, for the ſake of perſpicuity, made an alteration on the arrangement of the words, but not greater than that made by our tranſlators, which has the contrary effect, and involves the ſentence in obſcurity.

32. *When thou haſt recovered thyſelf,* συ επιστρεψας. E. T. *When thou art converted.* There is preciſely the ſame reaſon againſt rendering επιστρεψας, in this place, *converted*, which there is againſt rendering στραφητι, Mt. xviii. 3. in the ſame way. See the note on that verſe.

36. *Let him who hath no ſword, ſell his mantle, and buy one*—ο μη εχων, πωλησατω το ιματιον αυτου, και αγορασατω μαχαιραν. A great number of MSS. and ſome of note, have the two verbs in the future, πωλησει and αγορασει, inſtead of the imperative. In this way, it is alſo read in ſome of the oldeſt editions. I think, however, that there is no occaſion here to deſert the common reading. The ſenſe in ſuch prophetical ſpeeches is the ſame, either way rendered. In the animated language of the Prophets, their predictions are often announced under the form of commands. The Prophet Iſaiah, in the ſublime prediction he has given us of the fate of the king of Babylon, thus foretells the deſtruction of his family (xiv. 21.): *Prepare ſlaughter for his children, for the iniquity of their fathers, that they do not riſe, nor poſſeſs the land.* Yet the inſtruments by which Providence intended to effect the extirpation of the tyrant's family, were none

of

of thoſe to whom the prophecy was announced. The Prophet Jeremiah, in like manner, foretells the approaching deſtruction of the children of Zion, by exhibiting God as thus addreſſing the people (ix. 17, 18.): *Call for the mourning women, that they may come; and ſend for cunning women; and let them make haſte, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eye-lids guſh out with waters.* There matter of ſorrow is predicted, by commanding the common attendants on mourning and lamentation to be gotten in readineſs; here warning is given of the moſt imminent dangers, by orders to make the cuſtomary preparation againſt violence, and to account a weapon more neceſſary than a garment. In the prophecy of Ezekiel (xxxix. 17, 18, 19.), and in the Apocalypſe (xix. 17, 18.), ſo far is this allegoric ſpirit carried, that we find orders given to brute animals to do what the Prophet means only to foretell us they will do. Indeed, this is ſo much in the vivid manner of ſcriptural prophecy, that I am aſtoniſhed that a man of Biſhop Pearce's abilities ſhould have been ſo puzzled to reconcile this clauſe to our Saviour's intention of yielding without reſiſtance, that, rather than admit it, he would recur to an expedient, whoſe tendency is but too evidently to render Scripture precarious and uncertain.

38. *Here are two ſwords—It is enough.* The remark here made by the diſciples, and our Lord's anſwer, ſhow manifeſtly two things; the firſt is, that his meaning was not perfectly comprehended by them; the ſecond, that he did not think it neceſſary, at that time, to open the matter further to them. Their remark evinces that they underſtood him literally; and it is, by conſequence, a confirmation (if a confirmation were needed) of the common reading of verſe 36. By his anſwer *it is enough*; though he declined attempting to undeceive them by entering further into the ſubject, he ſignified, with ſufficient plainneſs, to thoſe who ſhould reflect on what he ſaid, that arms were not the reſource they ought to think of. For what were two ſwords againſt all the ruling powers of the nation? The import of the proverbial expreſſion here uſed by our Lord, is, therefore, this, 'We need no 'more;' which does not imply that they really needed, or would uſe, thoſe they had.

51. *Let this ſuffice,* εατε εως τουτου. E. T. *Suffer ye thus far.* This verſion is obſcure, and ſuſceptible of very different interpretations. All antiquity ſeems agreed in underſtanding our Lord's expreſſion as a check to his diſciples, by intimating that they were not to proceed further in the way of reſiſtance; as it was not to ſuch methods of defence that he choſe to recur. What is recorded by the other Evangeliſts (Mt. xxvi. 52, 53. J. xviii. 11.), as likewiſe ſaid on the occaſion, ſtrongly confirms this explanation. Another, indeed, has been ſuggeſted; namely, that the words were ſpoken to the ſoldiers, who are ſuppoſed, before now, to have ſeized his perſon; and that our Lord aſked of them, that they would grant him liberty to go to the man whoſe ear had been cut off, that he might cure him; the only inſtance wherein Jeſus needed the permiſſion or the aid of any man in working a miracle. An explanation this, every way exceptionable; but it is ſufficient here to take notice, that it is totally deſtitute of evidence. Elſner, who favours this interpretation, after giving what he takes to be the ſenſe, in a paraphraſtical explanation, quotes, by way of evidence, two paſſages from the ſame author, in order to prove——what was never queſtioned by any body, that εως, followed by the genitive, ſometimes anſwers to the La. *ad.* The only thing in the preſent caſe, which requires proof, is, that ſuch an elliptis, made by the ſuppreſſion of two principal words, με ελθειν, is conſiſtent with uſe in the language; and the only proof is precedents. Would *finite ad iſtum*, in La. or, which is equivalent, *ſuffer to him*, in Eng. convey that ſenſe? Yet nobody will deny, that *finite me ire ad iſtum*, in the one language, *and ſuffer me to go to him*, in the other, clearly expreſs it. Juſt ſo, it is admitted, that εατε ελθειν εμε εως τουτου would convey that ſenſe, though εατε εως τουτου does not. The extent of uſe in Gr. is learnt only from examples, as well as in La. and Eng. Now, in the quotations brought by Elſner, there is no elliptis at all; conſequently they are not to the purpoſe. On the other hand, every body knows that εως, which is an adverb of time, when joined to τουτου, means commonly *hucuſque, hitherto*; and that adverbs of time are occaſionally uſed as nouns, may be eaſily exemplified in moſt languages. *Behold now,* ſays Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 2. *is the accepted time*—Ιδου νυν καιρος ευπροσδεκτος. The words of our Lord, then, in the moſt ſimple and natural interpretation, denote, *Let paſs what is done—Enough of this—No more of this.*

52. *Officers of the temple-guard,* στρατηγους του ιερου. E. T. *Captains of the temple.* The temple had always a guard of Levites, who kept watch in it, by turns, day and night. There are references to this practice in the O. T. both in the Prophets and in the Pſalms. Over this guard, one of the prieſts was appointed captain; and this office, according to Joſephus, was next in dignity to that of high prieſt. It appears from Acts iv. 1. v. 24. 26. as well as from the Jewiſh hiſtorian, that there was only one who had the chief command. The plural number is here uſed for comprehending thoſe who were aſſigned to the captain as counſellors and aſſiſtants. The addition of the word *guard*, ſeemed to be neceſſary in Eng. for the ſake of perſpicuity.

52. *Clubs,* ξυλων. E. T. *Staves.* *A Staff* is intended principally for aſſiſting us in walking; *a club* is a weapon both offenſive and defenſive. The former is, in Gr. ραβδος; the latter, ξυλον. To ſhow that theſe words are, in the Goſpels, never uſed promiſcuouſly, let it be obſerved, that, in our Lord's commands to his Apoſtles, in relation to the diſcharge of their office, when what concerned their own accommodation in travelling is ſpoken of, the word ραβδος is uſed by

by all the three Evangeliſts, Mt. Mr. and L. who take particular notice of that tranſaction. But, in the account given by the ſame Evangeliſts of the armed multitude, ſent by the high prieſts and elders to apprehend our Lord, they never employ the term ραζδος, but always ξυλον.

54. *Then they ſeized him, and led him away to the high prieſt's houſe,* συλλαβοντες δε αυτον ηγαγον, και εισηγαγον αυτον εις την οικιαν τ αρχιερεως. E. T. *Then took they him and led him, and brought him into the high prieſt's houſe.* Vul. *Comprehendentes autem eum, duxerunt ad domum principis ſacerdotum.* The words και εισηγαγον αυτον, are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. and ſome Evangeliſtaries. The Sy. and Sax. interpreters, and, therefore, probably the author of the old Itc. verſion, have not read them. It is plain they add nothing to the ſenſe. Ηγαγον εις τον οικον, and εισηγαγον εις τον οικον, are the ſame thing. One of theſe, ſuperadded to the other, is a mere tautology. Beſides, there appears ſomething of quaintneſs in the expreſſion, αυτον ηγαγον και εισηγαγον αυτον, which is very unlike this writer's ſtyle. I have, therefore, preferred here the more ſimple manner of the Vul. and the Sy.

55. *When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the court,* αψαντων δε πυρ εν μεσω της αυλης. E. T. *When they had kindled a fire in the midſt of the hall.* The expreſſion εν μεσω, is an evidence that this αυλη was an open court. Beſides, αυλη here appears contradiſtinguiſhed to οικος, in the preceding verſe. Mt. xxvi. 58. N.

66. *The national ſenate,* το πρεσβυτεριον τ λαυ. E. T. *The elders of the people.* I do not introduce this title here, as though there were any difficulty in explaining it, or any difference, in reſpect of ſenſe, in the different tranſlations given of it; but ſolely to remark, that this Evangeliſt is the only ſacred writer who gives this denomination to the *ſanhedrim;* for there can be no doubt that it is of it he is ſpeaking. This is the only paſſage in the Goſpel where it occurs. The ſame writer (Acts xxii. 5.) alſo applies the title πρεσβυτεριον, without the addition τ λαυ, to this court, or at leaſt to the members whereof it was compoſed, conſidered as a body. I thought it allowable, where it can be done with propriety (for it cannot in every caſe), to imitate even theſe little differences in the ſtyle of the inſpired penmen. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 9, 10.

CHAP. XXIII.

11. *A ſhining robe,* εσθητα λαμπραν. E. T. *A gorgeous robe.* Vul. *Veſte alba.* Er. Zu. Caſ. Be. *Veſte ſplendida.* Though the Gr. word may be rendered either way, I prefer the latter, as denoting that quality of the garment which was the moſt remarkable; for this epithet was moſt properly given to thoſe veſtments wherein both qualities, white and ſhining, were united. That the word λαμπρος was uſed for *white,* the application of it by Polybius to the *toga* worn by the candidates for offices at Rome, if there were no other evidence, would be ſufficient. But when nothing beſide the colour was intended, the word λευκος was uſed correſponding to the La. *albus,* as λαμπρος did to *candidus.* Such white and ſplendid robes were worn in the Eaſt by ſovereigns. Herod cauſed our Lord to be dreſſed in ſuch a garment, not, as I imagine, to ſignify the opinion he had of his innocence, but in deriſion of his pretenſions to royalty. Perhaps it was intended to inſinuate, that thoſe pretenſions were ſo abſurd as to merit no other puniſhment than contempt and ridicule.

15. *He hath done nothing to deſerve death,* ουδεν αξιον θανατου εστι πεπραγμενον αυτω. E. T. *Nothing worthy of death is done unto him.* This, though unintelligible, is a literal verſion from the Vul. Er. and Zu. *Nihil dignum morte actum eſt ei:* the meaning of which, as it is here connected, if it have a meaning, is, 'Herod 'hath not deſerved to die for any thing he hath done 'to Jeſus.' Now, as it is certain that this cannot be Pilate's meaning, being quite foreign from his purpoſe, I ſee no other reſource but in ſuppoſing, that πεπραγμενον αυτω is equivalent to πεπραγμενον υπ' αυτ. I am not fond of recurring to unuſual conſtructions: but here, I think, there is a neceſſity; inaſmuch as this ſentence of Pilate, interpreted by the ordinary rules, and conſidered in reference to his ſubject, is downright nonſenſe. As to other verſions, the Sy. has rendered the words not more intelligibly than the Vul. Caſ. adopting the conſtruction here defended, ſays, *nihil morte dignum ab hoc factum eſſe.* Be. to the ſame purpoſe, *nihil dignum morte factum eſt ab eo.* Lu. keeps cloſe to the Vul. The G. F. has followed the Vul. in what regards the conſtruction, but has introduced a ſupply, from conjecture, to make out a meaning,—*rien ne lui a été fait* [*qui importe qu'il ſoit*] *digne de mort.* Dio. has taken the ſame method,—*nienti gli e ſtato fatto* [*di cio che ſi farebbe a uno*] *che haveſſe meritata la morte.* It is ſtrange that Be. has not here been followed by any of thoſe Proteſtant tranſlators, who have ſometimes, without neceſſity (where there was no difficulty in the words), followed him in the liberties he had taken, much more exceptionable, in reſpect of the ſenſe, than the preſent, and leſs defenſible, in reſpect of the expreſſion. Some more recent tranſlators, both Fr. and Eng. L. Cl. Dodd. and others, admit the manner of conſtruing the ſentence adopted here. I ſhall ſubjoin a few things, which had influence with me in forming a judgment of this matter. A ſimilar example is not, I believe, to be found in the N. T. nor in the Sep.; but ſo many examples of πεπραγμενον τινι for πεπραγμενον υπο τινος, have been produced from claſſical authors, by Raphelius and Wet. as ſhow it to have been no uncommon idiom. Now, though L. abounds in Hebraiſms, as much as any ſacred writer, yet he has, oftener than the reſt, recourſe to words and idioms which he could acquire only from converſing with the Gentiles, or reading their authors; and has, upon the whole, as was obſerved before (Preface, § 11.),

greater variety in his ſtyle than any other of the Evangeliſts. Further, it ſtrengthens the argument, that πρασσειν αξιον θανατου, is a phraſe not unfrequent with L. (ſee Acts xxv. 11. 25. xxvi. 31.), for expreſſing to do what deſerveth death; and, as the only inquiry on this occaſion was, what Jeſus had done, and what he deſerved to ſuffer, there is the ſtrongeſt internal probability, from the ſcope of the place, that it muſt mean what had been done by him, and not to him. Laſtly, no other verſion that is both intelligible and ſuited to the context, can be given, without a much greater departure from the ordinary rules of interpretation and of ſyntax than that here made. To be convinced of this, one needs only conſider a little the Itn. and G. F. tranſlations of this paſſage above recited.

23. *Their clamours, and thoſe of the chief prieſts prevailed*—κατισχυον αι φωναι αυτων και των αρχιερεων. Vul. *Invaleſcebant voces eorum.* With this, agree one MS. which omits και των αρχιερεων, and the Sax. and Cop. verſions.

35. *The elect of God*, ὁ τȣ Θεȣ ἐκλεκτος. This title is adopted from Iſaiah, xlii 1. and appears to be one of thoſe by which the Meſſiah was at that time diſtinguiſhed. Diſſ. V. P. IV. § 14.

43. *Paradiſe.* Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 19, 20, 21.

54. *The ſabbath approached*, σαββατον επιφωσκε. Vul. *Sabbatum illuceſcebat.* The Jews, in their way of reckoning the days, counted from ſun-ſet to ſunſet, thus beginning the natural day, το νυχθημερον, with the night. This had been the manner from the earlieſt ages. Moſes, in his hiſtory of the creation, concludes the account of the ſeveral days in this manner—*And the evening and the morning were the firſt day;*—and ſo of all the ſix, always making mention of the evening firſt. There is ſome reaſon to think, that the ſame method of counting had, in very ancient times, prevailed in other nations. It was not, however, the way that obtained in the neighbouring countries in the time of the Apoſtles. Moſt others ſeem, at that time, to have reckoned as we do, from midnight to midnight; and, in diſtinguiſhing the two conſtituent parts of the natural day, named the morning firſt. Had the Jewiſh practice been univerſal, it is hardly poſſible that ſuch a phraſe as σαββατον επιφωσκε, *ſabbatum illuceſcebat*, to ſignify that the ſabbath was drawing on, had ever ariſen. The expreſſions, then, might have been ſuch as Lightfoot ſuppoſes, εις σαββατον εσκοτιωθη, and *obtenebreſcebat in ſabbatum;* the ſabbath being, as every other day, uſhered in with darkneſs, which advances with it for ſeveral hours. The conjecture of Grotius, that L. in this expreſſion, refers to the light of the ſtars, which do not appear till after ſun-ſet, and to the moon, which gives at leaſt no ſenſible light till then, is quite unſatisfactory. That the coming of night ſhould, on this account, be ſignified by an expreſſion which denotes the increaſe of light, is not more natural than it would be to expreſs the progreſs of the morning, at ſun-riſe, by a phraſe which implies the increaſe of darkneſs, and which we might equally well account for by ſaying that, in conſequence of the ſun's riſing, the ſtars diſappear, and we no longer enjoy moon-ſhine. I am no better pleaſed with the ſuppoſition, to which Wet. ſeems to point, that there is an alluſion here to a Jewiſh cuſtom of uſhering in the ſabbath by lighting lamps in their houſes. The tranſactions ſpoken of in this chapter, were all without doors, where thoſe lights could have no effect; beſides, they were too inconſiderable to occaſion ſo flagrant a deviation from truth, as to diſtinguiſh the advance of the evening by an expreſſion which denotes the increaſe of the light. Lightfoot's hypotheſis is, as uſual, ingenious, but formed entirely on the language and uſages of modern rabbies. He obſerves that, with them, the Hebrew אור, anſwering to the Greek φως, is uſed for night; and, taking it for granted that this uſe is as ancient as our Saviour's time, the approach of night would naturally, he thinks, be expreſſed by επιφωσκω, *illuceſco.* But let it be obſerved, that as the rabbinical works quoted are comparatively recent, and as their language is much corrupted with moderniſms from European and other tongues, it is not ſafe to infer, merely from their uſe, what obtained in the times of the Apoſtles. As to the word in queſtion, certain it is, that we have no veſtige of ſuch a uſe in the O. T. There are not many words which occur oftener than אור; but it never means night, or has been ſo rendered by any tranſlator whatever. The authors of the Sep. have never uſed φως in rendering לילה, the Heb. word for *night*, nor νυξ in rendering אור. The word φως never ſignifies *night*, in the Jewiſh Apocryphal writings, nor in the N. T. I even ſuſpect that, in the modern rabbinical dialect, it does not mean *night* excluſively, but the natural day, νυχθημερον, including both; in which caſe it is a mere Latiniſm, *lux*, for *dies*. Nay, ſome of his own quotations give ground for this ſuſpicion. What he has rendered *luce diei decimæ quartæ*, is literally from the original quoted *luce decima quarta*. Nor does it invalidate this opinion, that the thing mentioned, clearing the houſe of leaven before the paſſover, is, according to their preſent cuſtoms, diſpatched in the night-time, and with candle-light. The expreſſion may, notwithſtanding, be uſed as generally as thoſe employed in the law, which did not, in the diſcharge of this duty, confine them to the night; nor does their uſe of candles or lamps, in this ſervice, ſhow that they confined themſelves to the night. Even in the day-time, theſe are neceſſary for a ſearch, wherein not a preſs or corner, hole or cranny, in the houſe is to be left unexplored. But admitting that the rabbies have ſometimes prepoſterouſly uſed the word אור, for the *night*, of which the learned author has produced the teſtimony of one of their gloſſaries, its admiſſion into a work whoſe uſe is to interpret into proper Heb. the barbariſms and impropriеties which have, in latter ages been

foiſted into their tongue, is itſelf ſufficient evidence that it is a mere modern corruption. How, indeed, can it be otherwiſe? Moſes tells us (Gen. i. 5.) that at the creation, *God called the light day, and the darkneſs he called night.* But this right uſe of words, theſe prepoſterous teachers have thought proper to reverſe, being literally of the number of thoſe ſtigmatized by the Prophet (Iſaiah v. 20.), as putting *darkneſs for light, and light for darkneſs.* The way, therefore, wherein I would account for this expreſſion of the Evangeliſt (a way which has been hinted by ſome former interpreters) is very ſimple. In all the nations round (the Jews, perhaps, alone excepted) it was cuſtomary to reckon the morning the firſt part of the day, the evening the ſecond. Thoſe who reckoned in this manner, would naturally apply the verb επιφωσκω to the uſhering in of the day. L. who was, according to Euſebius, from Antioch of Syria, by living much among Gentiles, and thoſe who uſed this ſtyle, or even by frequent occaſions of converſing with ſuch, would inſenſibly acquire a habit of uſing it. A habit of thus expreſſing the commencement of a new day, contracted where the expreſſion was not improper, will account for one's falling into it occaſionally, when, in conſequence of a difference in a ſingle circumſtance, the term is not ſtrictly proper. And this, by the way, is at leaſt a preſumption of the truth of a remark I lately made, that this Evangeliſt has, oftner than the reſt, recourſe to words and idioms which he muſt have acquired from the converſation of the heathen, or from reading their books. This is an expreſſion of that kind which, though it might readily be imported, could not originate among the Jews. I ſhall only add, that the uſe which Mt. makes of the ſame verb (xxviii. 1.) is totally different. He is there ſpeaking of the morning, when the women came to our Lord's ſepulchre, which was a good while after ſunriſe. Here, on the contrary, the time ſpoken of is the approach of ſun-ſet; for the ſetting of the ſun made the beginning of the ſabbath.

CHAP. XXIV.

1. *With ſome others,* και τινες συν αυταις. Theſe words are wanting in two or three MSS. They are omitted alſo in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. verſions; but are in the Sy. and the Ara. The external evidence againſt their admiſſion, compared with the evidence in their favour, is as nothing. But a ſort of internal evidence has been pleaded againſt them. As no women are named, either here, or in the concluſion of the preceding chapter, what addition does it make to the ſenſe to ſay, *with ſome others?* Or what is the meaning of it, where none are ſpecified? I anſwer, the women ſpoken of here, though not named, are mentioned in the laſt verſe but one of the foregoing chapter, under this deſcription—*the women who had accompanied Jeſus from Galilee.* Now, where is the abſurdity of ſuppoſing that thoſe pious women from Galilee were accompanied by ſome of our Lord's female diſciples from Jeruſalem and its neighbourhood? As it is certain that our Lord had there many diſciples alſo, I ſee no reaſon why we ſhould not here be determined ſolely by the weight and number of authorities.

12. *He went away muſing, with aſtoniſhment, on what had happened,* απηλθε, προς εαυτον θαυμαζων το γεγονος. Some point the words differently, removing the comma after απηλθε, and placing it after εαυτον; and, in conſequence of this alteration, render the clauſe, *he went home, wondering at what had happened.* Thus, J. xx. 10. Απηλθον παλιν προς εαυτους οι μαθηται, is rendered, in the E. T. *Then the diſciples went away again unto their own home.* That the words of L. admit of ſuch an adjuſtment and tranſlation, cannot be denied. The common punctuation, however, appears to me preferable, for theſe reaſons: 1ſt, It is that which has been adopted by all the ancient tranſlations, the Cop. alone excepted. 2dly, It has a particular ſuitableneſs to the ſtyle of this Evangeliſt. Thus, ch. xviii. 11. προς εαυτον ταυτα προσηυχετο, is, in the E. T. rendered, *prayed thus with himſelf;* though, I confeſs, it admits another verſion; and, xx. 14. διελογιζοντο προς εαυτους, *they reaſoned among themſelves.* 3dly, It appears more probable from what we are told, verſe 24th of this chapter, and from the account given by J. ch. xx. that Peter did not go directly home, but returned to the place where the Apoſtles, and ſome other diſciples, were aſſembled. And this appears to be the import of απηλθον προς εαυτους, J. xx. 10. which ſee.

18. *Art thou the only ſtranger in Jeruſalem who is unacquainted?* Συ μονος παροικεις εν Ιερουσαλημ, και μη εγνως; E. T. *Art thou only a ſtranger in Jeruſalem, and haſt not known?* There are two ways wherein the words of Cleopas may be underſtood by the reader; one is as a method of accounting for the apparent ignorance of this traveller; the other as an expreſſion of ſurpriſe, that any one who had been at Jeruſalem at the time, though but a ſtranger, ſhould not know what had made ſo much noiſe amongſt all ranks, and had ſo much occupied, for ſome days, all the leading men in the nation, the chief prieſts, the ſcribes, the rulers, and the whole ſanhedrim, as well as the Roman procurator and the ſoldiery. The common verſion favours the firſt interpretation; I prefer the ſecond, in concurrence, as I imagine, with the majority of interpreters, ancient and modern. I cannot diſcover with Be. any thing in it remote from common ſpeech. On the contrary, I think it, in ſuch a caſe as the preſent, ſo natural an expreſſion of ſurpriſe, that examples, remarkably ſimilar, may be produced from moſt languages. Dio. ο. Συ αρα, τιτε, μονος ανθρωπος ει τουτων α παντες ισασιν; *Are you the only perſon who have never heard what all the world knows?* Cicero, *pro Milone:* "An vos, judices, vero ſoli ignoratis, vos hoſ-"pites in hac urbe verſamini; veſtræ peregrinantur "aures, neque in hoc pervagato civitatis ſermone "verſantur?"

19. *Power-*

19. *Powerful in word and deed,* δυνατος εν εργω και λογω. I have here altered the order a little, for the ſake of avoiding a ſmall ambiguity; *in deed* might be miſtaken for the adverb. The firſt of theſe phraſes, *powerful in word,* relates to the wiſdom and eloquence which our Lord diſplayed in his teaching; the other relates to the miracles which he performed.

25. *O thoughtleſs men!* Ω ανοητοι. E. T. *O fools.* The word is not Ω μωροι. The two words are not ſynonymous. The term laſt mentioned, is a term of great indignation, and ſometimes of contempt; that employed here is a term of expoſtulation and reproof.

29. *They conſtrained him,* παρεβιασαντο αυτον. How did they conſtrain him? Did they lay violent hands on him, and carry him in, whether he would or not? The ſequel ſhows—*ſaying, abide with us; for it groweth late, and the day is far ſpent.* The expreſſion, in ſuch caſes, muſt always be interpreted according to popular uſage. Uſages, ſuch as this, of expreſſing great urgency of ſolicitation by terms which, in ſtrictneſs, imply force and compulſion, are common in every tongue. How little, then, is there of candour, or at leaſt of common ſenſe, in the expoſition which has been given by ſome, of a like phraſe of the ſame writer, ch. xiv. 23. *Compel them to come in,* αναγκασον εισελθειν?

36. *Peace be unto you,* ειρηνη υμιν. Vul. *Pax vobis: ego ſum, nolite timere.* Two Gr. MSS. agreeably to this tranſlation, add εγω ειμι· μη φοβεισθε. Both the Sy. alſo the Cop. the Sax. and the Arm. verſions, are conformable to this reading.

43. *Which he took and ate in their preſence,* και λαβων ενωπιον αυτων εφαγεν. Vul. *Et cum manducaſſet coram eis, ſumens reliquias dedit eis.* With this agree the Cop. and Sax. verſions, and three Gr. MSS. which add και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις. There are ſome other variations on this verſe, which it is not neceſſary here to ſpecify.

44. *In the law of Moſes, and the Prophets, and the Pſalms,* εν τω νομω Μωσεως και Προφηταις και Ψαλμοις. Under theſe three the Jews were wont to comprehend all the books of the O. T. Under the name *law,* the five books called the Pentateuch were included; the chief hiſtorical books were joined with *the Prophets*; and all the reſt with *the Pſalms.*

49. *I ſend you that which my father hath promiſed.* Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 14.

52. *Having worſhipped him,* προσκυνησαντες αυτον: that is, *having thrown themſelves proſtrate before him,* as the words, ſtrictly interpreted, imply. Mt. ii. 2. [illegible] N.

N O T E S

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY JOHN.

CHAP. I.

1. *IN the beginning was the word,* εν αρχη ην ὁ λογος. I have here followed the E. T. and the majority of modern verſions. Vul. and Zu. *In principio erat verbum.* Er. Be. and Caſ. have, inſtead of *verbum*, uſed the word *ſermo*. The Gr. word λογος is ſuſceptible of ſeveral interpretations, the chief of which are theſe two, *reaſon* and *ſpeech—ratio* and *oratio*. The former is properly ὁ λογος ὁ ενδιαθετος, *ratio mente concepta;* the latter ὁ λογος ὁ προφορικος, *ratio enunciativa*. The latter acceptation is that which has been adopted by moſt interpreters. If the practice of preceding tranſlators is ever entitled to implicit regard from their ſucceſſors, it is where the ſubject is of ſo abſtruſe a nature, as hardly to admit an expoſition which is not liable to ſtrong objections. For my part, the difference between *verbum* and *ſermo* appears too inconſiderable, in a caſe of this kind, to induce one to leave the beaten track. Were I to deſert it (which I do not think there is here ſufficient evidence to warrant), I ſhould prefer the word *reaſon*, as ſuggeſting the inward principle or faculty, and not the external enunciation, which may be called *word* or *ſpeech*. Things plauſible may be advanced in ſupport of either mode of interpreting. In favour of the common verſion, *word*, it may be urged, that there is here a manifeſt alluſion to the account given of the creation in the firſt chapter of Geneſis, where we learn, that *God, in the beginning, made all things by his word. God ſaid—and it was ſo.* In favour of the other interpretation, ſome have contended, that there is a reference in the expreſſion to the doctrine of the Platoniſts; whilſt others are no leſs poſitive, that the ſacred author had, in his eye, the ſentiments of Philo the Jew. Perhaps theſe two ſuppoſitions amount to the ſame thing in effect; at leaſt it is more probable, that the Jewiſh theoriſt borrowed his notions on this ſubject from the Gr. philoſopher, than that the Evangeliſt ſhould have recourſe to an idolater. For my part, I entirely agree with thoſe who think it moſt likely that the alluſion here is to a portion of holy writ, and not to the reveries of either Philo or Plato. The paſſage of holy writ referred to, is Prov. viii. throughout. What is here termed ὁ λογος, is there η σοφια. There is ſuch a coincidence in the things attributed to each, as evidently ſhows, that both were intended to indicate the ſame divine perſonage. The paſſage in the Proverbs, I own, admits a more familiar explanation, as regarding the happy conſequences of that mental quality which we may call true or heavenly wiſdom. But it is ſuitable to the genius of ſcripture prophecy to convey, under ſuch allegorical language, the moſt important and ſublime diſcoveries. Plauſible arguments, therefore (though not, perhaps, perfectly deciſive), might be urged for rendering λογος, in this paſſage, *reaſon*. But as the common rendering, which is alſo not without its plauſibility, has had the concurrent teſtimony of tranſlators, ancient as well as modern, and ſeems well adapted to the office of the Meſſiah, as the oracle and interpreter of God, I thought it, upon the whole, better to retain it.

2. *The word was God,* θεος ην ὁ λογος. The old Engliſh tranſlation authoriſed by Henry VIII. following the arrangement uſed in the original, ſays,

God was the word. In this manner, Luther alſo, in his German tranſlation, renders it **Gott war das Wort**. Others maintain (though, perhaps, the opinion has not been adopted by any tranſlator), that, as the word Θεος is here without the article, the clauſe ſhould be, in Engliſh, *a God was the word.* But to this, ſeveral anſwers may be given. 1ſt, It may be argued that, though the article prefixed ſhows a noun to be definite, the bare want of the article is not ſufficient evidence that the noun is uſed indefinitely. See verſes 6th, 12th, 13th, and 18th, of this chapter; in all which, though the word Θεος has no article, there can be no doubt that it means God, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. 2dly, It is a known uſage in the language to diſtinguiſh the ſubject in a ſentence from what is predicated of it, by prefixing the article to the ſubject, and giving no article to the predicate. This is obſerved more carefully when the predicate happens, as in this paſſage, to be named firſt. Raphelius has given an excellent example of this from Herodotus, Νυξ ἡ ἡμερα εγενετο σφι μαχομενοισι, "The "day was turned into night before they had done "fighting." Here it is only by means of the article that we know this to be the meaning. Take from ἡμερα the article, and prefix it to νυξ, and the ſenſe will be inverted; it will be then, *the night was turned into day.*—An example of the ſame idiom we have from Xenophon's Hellen. in theſe words, Ὁ Θεος πολλακις χαιρει, τους μεν μικρους μεγαλους ποιων, τους δε μεγαλους μικρους. Here, though the ſubject is named before the predicate, it is much more clearly diſtinguiſhed by the article than by the place, which has not the importance in the Gr. and La. languages that it has in ours. That the ſame uſe obtained in the idiom of the ſynagogue, may be evinced from ſeveral paſſages, particularly from Iſaiah v. 20. rendered by the Seventy, Ουαι οι λεγοντες το πονηρον καλον, και το καλον πονηρον, οι τιθεντες το σκοτος φως, και το φως σκοτος, οι τιθεντες το πικρον γλυκυ, και το γλυκυ πικρον. This is intirely ſimilar to the example from Xenophon. In both, the ſame words have, and want, the article alternately, as they are made the ſubject, or the predicate, of the affirmations. I ſhall add two examples from the N. T. πνευμα ὁ Θεος, J. iv. 24.; and παντα τα ἑμα σεισιν, L. xv. 31.

3. *All things were made by it; and without it*—— 4. *In it was life.* E. T. *All things were made by him; and without him*——*In him was life.* It is much more ſuitable to the figurative ſtyle here employed, to ſpeak of *the word*, though really denoting a perſon, as a thing, agreeably to the grammatical idiom, till a direct intimation is made of its perſonality. This intimation I conſider as made, verſe 4th, *In it was life.* The way of rendering here adopted, is agreeable to the practice of all tranſlators, except the Engliſh, as far as I have had occaſion to obſerve. In the original, the word λογος, being in the maſculine gender, did not admit a difference in the pronouns. In the Vul. the noun *verbum* is in the neuter gender. Accordingly, we have, in the ſecond verſe, *Hoc* (not *hic*) *erat in principio apud Deum.* In moſt of the oblique caſes, both of *hic* and of *ipſe*, the maſculine and the neuter are the ſame. In Italian, the name is *parola*, which is feminine. Accordingly the feminine pronoun is always uſed in referring to it. Thus Dio. *Eſſa era nel principio appo Iddio, Ogni coſa e ſtata fatta per eſſa; e ſenza eſſa.*—The ſame thing may be obſerved of all the Fr. interpreters who tranſlate from the Gr. As they render λογος by *parole*, a noun of the feminine gender, the pronoun which refers to it is always *elle.* In Ger. which, in reſpect of ſtructure, reſembles more our own language than either of the former does, the noun **Wort** is neuter. Accordingly, in Luther's tranſlation, the pronoun employed is **daſſelbige**, which is alſo neuter, and correſponds to *itſelf*, in Eng. As to Engliſh verſions, it is acknowledged that all poſterior to the common tranſlation have in this implicitly followed it. But it deſerves to be remarked, that every verſion which preceded it, as far as I have been able to diſcover, uniformly employed the neuter pronoun, *it.* So it is in that called the Biſhop's Bible, and in the G. E. Beſide that this method is more agreeable to grammatical propriety, it evidently preſerves the alluſion better which there is in this paſſage to the account of the creation given by Moſes, and ſuggeſts more ſtrongly the analogy that ſubſiſts between the work of creation and that of redemption, in reſpect of the ſame Almighty agent by whom both were carried into execution; for *by him God alſo made the worlds*, Hebrews i. 2. Add to all this, that the antecedent to the pronoun *it*, can only be *the word*; whereas the antecedent to *him* may be more naturally concluded to be *God*, the neareſt noun; in which caſe, the information given by the Evangeliſt, verſe 3d, amounts to no more than what Moſes has given us in the beginning of Geneſis, to wit, that God made all things; and what is affirmed in verſe 4th, denotes no more than that God is not inanimate matter, the univerſe, fate, or nature, but a living being endowed with intelligence and power. I believe every candid and judicious reader will admit, that ſomething more was intended by the Evangeliſt. Nor is there any danger leſt the terms ſhould, by one who gives the ſmalleſt attention to the attributes here aſcribed to *the word*, be too literally underſtood. Let it be obſerved further, that the method here taken is that which, in ſimilar caſes, is adopted by our tranſlators. Thus it is the ſame divine perſonage who, in verſe 4th, is called *the light of men*; to which, nevertheleſs, the pronoun *it* is applied, verſe 5th, without hurting our ears in the leaſt.

3. *Without it, not a ſingle creature was made,* χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδ εν ὁ γεγονεν. Some critics, by a different pointing, cut off the two laſt words, ὁ γεγονεν, from this ſentence, as redundant, and prefix them to the following, making verſe 4th run thus, ὁ γεγονεν εν αυτω ζωη ην. *What was made in it was life.* The Vul. is ſuſceptible of the like difference in meaning, from the different ways of pointing, as the Gr. is. The ſame

ſame may be ſaid of the Sy. and of ſome other tranſlations, both ancient and modern. In languages which do not admit this ambiguity, or in which tranſlators have not choſen to retain it, the general inclination appears to have been to the meaning here aſſigned. It is urged, in favour of the other, that it is much in John's manner, to begin ſentences with the word or words which concluded the ſentence immediately preceding. This is true, and we have ſome inſtances of it in this chapter; but it is alſo true, that it is much in the manner of this Evangeliſt to employ repetitions and tautologies, for the ſake of fixing the reader's attention on the ſentiments, and rendering them plainer. Of this, the preſent Goſpel, nay this very chapter, affords examples. Thus, verſe 7th, ηλθεν εις μαρτυριαν, ινα μαρτυρηση:—verſe 20th, ωμολογησε και ουκ ηρνησατο, και ωμολογησεν.—Admitting, therefore, that both interpretations were equally favoured by the genius of the tongue, and the Apoſtle's manner of writing, the common interpretation is preferable, becauſe ſimpler and more perſpicuous. The apparent repetition in this verſe is ſuppoſed, not implauſibly, to ſuggeſt, that not only the matter of the world was produced, but every individual being was formed by the word.

5. *The light ſhone in darkneſs, but the darkneſs admitted it not,* το φως εν τη σκοτια φαινει· και η σκοτια αυτο ου κατελαβεν. E. T. *The light ſhineth in darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not.* Nothing is a more diſtinguiſhing particularity of this writer's ſtyle, than the confounding of the tenſes. It is evident, from the connection of theſe clauſes, that the tenſe ought to be the ſame in both. And though it might admit ſome defence that, in clauſes connected as thoſe in the text, the firſt ſhould be expreſſed in the paſt, and the ſecond in the preſent, the reverſe is ſurely, on the principles of grammar, indefenſible. I have employed the paſt time in both, as more ſuitable to the ſtrain of the context. I think alſo it makes a clearer ſenſe; inaſmuch as the paſſage alludes to the reception which Jeſus Chriſt, here called the light, met with, whilſt he abode upon the earth, and the miſtakes of all his countrymen (the diſciples themſelves not excepted) in regard to his office and character.

9. *The true light was he who*—ην το φως το αληθινον ὁ—E. T. *That was the true light which*—When this verſe, in the original, is compared with the foregoing, it appears, upon the firſt glance, to be in direct contradiction to it: verſe 8th, ουκ ην εκεινος το φως; verſe 9th, ην το φως. As if we ſhould ſay, in Eng. *that man was not the light*——*He was the light.* But, on attending more cloſely, we find that, in verſe 8th εκεινος, referring to John the Baptiſt, is the ſubject of the propoſition; whereas, in verſe 9th, το φως is the ſubject. In this view, there is a perfect conſiſtency between the two aſſertions, as they relate to different ſubjects. For the greater perſpicuity, I have rendered what is affirmed of the true light, verſe 9th, *he who coming,* not *that which coming,* though this is the more literal verſion. My reaſon is, becauſe, in the following verſes, this light is ſpoken of always as a perſon. Now, the beſt place for introducing this change of manner is doubtleſs that wherein an explanation is purpoſely given of the phraſe, το φως το αληθινον. And that there is ſuch a change of manner in the original, is manifeſt. Thus the pronoun referring to φως, verſe 5th, is αυτο, in the neuter; but, after the explanation given, verſe 9th, we find, in verſes 10th, 11th, and 12th, αυτον, in the maſculine.

2. *Who, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man,* ὁ φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομενον εις τον κοσμον. E. T. *Which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* Vul. *Quæ illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum.* I have obſerved (Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 22.) that the word ερχομενον, in this place, is equivocal, as it may be underſtood to agree either with φως or with ανθρωπον. As the ambiguity could not well be preſerved in Eng. I have preferred the former method of rendering. Moſt modern tranſlators, Itn. Fr. and Gr. as well as ours, have, with the Vul. preferred the latter. The former way has been adopted by Caſ. and Leo de Juda, in La.; by L. Cl. and Beau. in Fr.; by the An. tranſlator and Dod. in Eng. The reaſons which determined my choice, are the following: 1ſt. Ὁ ερχομενος εις τον κοσμον, is a periphraſis by which the Meſſiah was at that time commonly denoted [as ch. vi. 14. xviii. 37.] 2dly, He is in this Goſpel once and again diſtinguiſhed as *the light that cometh into the world.* Thus, ch. iii. 19. *Now this is the condemnation, that the light* (το φως) *is come into the world*:—ch. xii. 46. *I am come a light into the world.* 3dly, I do not find, on the other hand, that ερχομενος εις τον κοσμον, *who cometh into the world,* is ever employed by the ſacred writers as an addition to πας ανθρωπος, *every man.* I am far from pretending that words, not abſolutely neceſſary, are not ſometimes uſed in Scripture to render the expreſſion more forcible. But it muſt be allowed to have weight in the preſent caſe, that a phraſe which never occurs in the application that ſuits the common verſion, is familiar in the application that ſuits the verſion given here. 4thly, The meaning conveyed in this verſion appears more conſonant to fact than the other. To ſay that the Meſſiah, by coming into the world, lighteth every man, is, in my apprehenſion, no more than to ſay that he has, by his coming, rendered the ſpiritual light of his Goſpel acceſſible to all, without diſtinction, who chuſe to be guided by it. The other, at leaſt, ſeems to imply, that every individual has in fact been enlightened by him. Markland obſerves (Bowyer's Conjectures), that if ερχομενον agreed with ανθρωπον, it would have probably had the article, and been τον ερχομενον. But on this I do not lay ſtreſs; for though the remark is founded in the Gr. idiom, ſuch minute circumſtances are not always minded by the Evangeliſts.

11. *He came to his own land, and his own people did not receive him,* εις τα ιδια ηλθε, και οι ιδιοι αυτον ου παρελαβον.

παρελαβον. E. T. *He came unto his own, and his own received him not.* The E. T. is right, as far as it goes, but not so explicit as the original. The distinction made by the author between τα ιδια and οι ιδιοι, is overlooked by the interpreter. As by that distinction the country of Judea, and the people of the Jews, are more expressly marked, I have thought it worthy of being retained. For a similar phrase to εις τα ιδια, see L. ii. 49. N. Though τα ιδια commonly means *home*, this is not always to be understood strictly for *one's own house*. A man naturally considers his *country*, when he is at a distance from it, as his *home*. Diss. XII. P. IV. § 8.

12, 13. *Children of God, who derive their birth not from blood.* That is, children by a generation spiritual and divine, which has nothing in common with natural generation.

14. *The word became incarnate,* ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο. E. T. *The word was made flesh.* In the language of the synagogue, the term σαρξ was so often employed to denote *a human being*, that the Evangelist's expression would not sound so harshly in the ears of those accustomed to that idiom, as the literal version of the words does in ours. Besides, *was made* does not entirely correspond to εγενετο as used here, being a translation rather of the La. *factum est*, than of the Gr. I have for these reasons preferred the phrase *became incarnate*, which, if it does not so much trace the letter of the original as the common rendering does, is closer to the sense, and sufficiently simple and intelligible.

[2] *Sojourned,* εσκηνωσεν. E. T. *Dwelt.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cas. *Habitavit.* Be. *Commoratus est.* Most foreign versions follow the Vul. An. *Had his tabernacle.* Dod. *Pitched his tabernacle.* Wes. and Wy. *Tabernacled.* The rest follow the common version. The primitive signification of the verb σκηνοω, from σκηνη *tent* or *tabernacle*, is, doubtless, *to pitch a tent*, or *dwell in a tent.* But words come insensibly to deviate from their first signification. This has evidently happened to the verb in question. As a tent, from its nature, must be a habitation of but short continuance, the verb formed from it would quickly come to signify to reside for a little time, more as a sojourner than as an inhabitant. This is well deduced by Phavorinus, σκηνη, η προσκαιρος κατοικια· σκηνοω, το προς καιρον οικησιν ποιεμαι, which exactly suits the sense of *commoror, I sojourn.* It must be owned also (as may be evinced from unexceptionable authorities), that the verb means sometimes simply *to dwell*, in the largest sense, without any limitation from the nature, or the duration, of the dwelling. Thus the inhabitants of heaven are called (Rev. xii. 12. and xiii. 6.) οι εν ουρανοις σκηνουντες. Nay, which is still stronger, it is made use of to express God's abode with his people after the resurrection, which is always represented as eternal, Rev. xxi. 3. But we may be the less surprised at this, when we consider that σκηνη itself is used (Lu. xvi. 9.) for a permanent habitation, and joined with the epithet αιωνιος. See N. 3. on that verse. We cannot, therefore, deny that the manner wherein the word is rendered by the Vul. and the E. T. is entirely defensible. As the term, however, admits either interpretation; and as the word for *to dwell* commonly used in this Gospel, and even this chapter, is different; and as, considering the shortness of our Lord's life, especially of his ministry, he may be said more properly to have *sojourned* than to have *dwelt* amongst us; I have preferred Be.'s interpretation.

15. I look upon this verse as a parenthesis, in which the testimony of John is anticipated, verse 16th being in immediate connection with verse 14th. It is is for this reason I have not only enclosed verse 15th in hooks, but introduced it by the words *it was*, which render the connection closer. This will appear more evidently from what is to be remarked on verse 16th.

[2] *Is preferred to me,* εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν. Vul. *Ante me factus est.* Er. and Zu. *Antecessit me.* Cas. *Ante me fuit.* Be. *Antepositus est mihi.* Dio. *M'è antiposto.* G. F. *Est preferé a moi.* L. Cl. *Est plus que moi.* Beau. *M'est préféré.* Ger. **vor mir gewesen ist.** E. T. Dod. Hey. Wes. Wy. Wor. *Is preferred before me.* An. *Was before me.* There are but two meanings in all the variety of expressions employed in translating this passage. Some make it express *priority* in time, others *pre-eminence* in dignity. With the former we should undoubtedly class the Vul. and yet most of those who have translated from it, must be numbered among the latter. Thus the translators of P. R. and Sa. say, *A été préféré a moi.* Si. *Est au dessus de moi.* But, though the Vul. and the other Latin translators, Be. alone excepted, have adopted the first method; all the translators into modern languages I am acquainted with, Romish or Protestant (except Lu. the An. and the Rh.), have followed Be. in preferring the second. Were I here translating the Vul. I should certainly say with the interpreters of Rheims, *was made before me*, and should be ready to adopt Simon's own language (and with better reason than he has done) where he accuses Be. as well as the P. R. interpreters, of giving us, for a version, a mere comment which they ought to have put in the margin. But as I do not translate from the Vul. the case is different. Wh. indeed, a commentator of known and deserved reputation, thinks the proper import of εμπροσθεν to be *before in time*, and renders the Gr. expression *is before me.* "I find no instance," says he, "where εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν signifies, he was "preferred before me, and therefore rather chuse to "retain the proper import of the words." Maldonate, another commentator, justly celebrated for critical abilities and acuteness, is of an opinion directly opposite to Wh.'s. He affirms, that in Scripture εμπροσθεν never expresses priority of time. "Ut "multi notaverunt, non dixit προ μου, sed εμπροσθεν "μου; præpositio autem εμπροσθεν nusquam in sacris "literis reperitur tempus significare." Be. appears

to have thought ſo alſo when he ſaid, " Ego illos " libenter rogem, ut vel unum ex Novi Teſtamenti " libris exemplum proferant in quo εμπροσθεν tempus " declaret." Opinions ſo contrary cannot be both true; but both may be falſe, and I ſuſpect are ſo. That εμπροσθεν in the New Teſtament is ſometimes expreſſive of time, may be argued from theſe words of the Baptiſt, ch. iii. 28. *I am not the Meſſiah, but am ſent before him,* εμπροσθεν εκεινου. There is at the ſame time, it muſt be confeſſed, ſome relation to place here alſo. The word εμπροσθεν, in the moſt common acceptation, anſwers to the Latin *coram*, not ſeldom to *præ*, more rarely to *ante*. In the ſenſe of preference or ſuperiority, it is, doubtleſs, employed by the Seventy, Gen. xlviii. 20. εθηκεν τον Εφραιμ εμπροσθεν του Μανασση, *He ſet Ephraim before Manaſſeth:* for though it may be ſaid that Ephraim was the firſt named, it is only the preference implied as given to the younger brother, which ſeems to have been regarded by their father Joſeph. Chryſoſtom alſo, and other Gr. expoſitors, interpret in the ſame manner the words in the paſſage under conſideration. Add to this that, in theſe places of the Goſpel, which are pretty numerous, where priority in time alone is referred to, the word is never εμπροσθεν, but either προ or πριν, with the genitive of the noun, or the infinitive of the verb. See in this Goſpel (amongſt other places) ch. i. 48. iv. 49. v. 7. viii. 58. Another argument in favour of this interpretation is, that priority in time appears to be marked by the ſucceeding clauſe πρωτος μου ην, to be conſidered immediately. Now, to give the ſame meaning to both clauſes, is to repreſent the Evangeliſt as recurring to a ſophiſm which logicians call *idem per idem*, that is, proving a thing by itſelf, repeated with only ſome variety in the expreſſion; inſomuch that his reaſoning would amount to no more than this, *He was before me, becauſe he was before me.*

30 *For he was before me,* οτι πρωτος μου ην. Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Quia prior me erat.* Caſ. *Quippe qui prior me ſit.* The Sy. (though, in the former clauſe, the expreſſion may be thought ambiguous) is clearly to the ſame purpoſe with the aforeſaid verſions in this. In the ſame manner alſo Dio. Lu. and the Fr. tranſlators, except Beau. who ſays, *Parce qu'il eſt plus grand que moi.* With this agrees Hey. *For he is my ſuperior.* The other Eng. verſions concur with the E. T. The word πρωτος is no doubt a ſuperlative, and ſignifies not only firſt in time, but often alſo firſt in dignity and rank. When it is uſed in this way, it is commonly followed, like other ſuperlatives, by the genitive plural of that which is the ſubject of compariſon; or, if the ſubject be expreſſed by a collective noun, by the genitive ſingular. Thus (Mr. xii. 29.) πρωτη παντων των εντολων is *the chief of all the commandments,* (Acts, xxviii. 17) τους οντας των Ιουδαιων πρωτους, *the chief of the Jews.* In like manner (Mr. vi. 21.) οι πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας, and (L. xix. 47.) οι πρωτοι του λαου: for λαος is a collective noun, ſo alſo is Γαλιλαια the name of a country, when uſed by a trope for the inhabitants. But in the expreſſion in queſtion, there is neither collective nor genitive plural; πρωτος cannot therefore be rightly underſtood as a ſuperlative. But is there any ſimilar example in the ſacred writers? There is one ſimilar in this very Goſpel (xv. 18.), εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν, concerning the meaning of which, though the conſtruction is unuſual, there has hardly been, till very lately, a diverſity of opinion amongſt interpreters. Theſe have generally agreed in rendering the paſſage, *it hated me before it hated you.* The ſenſe which has been put on the word πρωτος, and ſo ſtrenuouſly defended by Dr. Lardner, ſhall be conſidered in the note on that place. Till then I ſhall take it for granted that what has hitherto been the commoneſt, explanation of the term, is alſo the cleareſt. Now, by every principle of ſound criticiſm, we ought to explain the doubtful by the clear, eſpecially as both examples, which are all the examples that Scripture affords us, are from the ſame pen; and as the paſſage thus explained yields a ſenſe which is both juſt and appoſite, there being at leaſt an apparent reference to the information he had given us concerning the λογος, *the word,* in the beginning of the chapter.

16 *Of his fulneſs we all have received, even grace for his grace.* Εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν, και χαριν αντι χαριτος. E. T. *Of his fulneſs have all we received, and grace for grace.* The context ſhows that the poſſeſſive pronoun αυτου, *his,* refers to ο λογος, *the word,* which, he ſays, became incarnate. But what is the import of the clauſe *grace for grace?* Is it that we receive grace, in return for the grace we give? So ſays L. Cl. availing himſelf of an ambiguity in the Greek word χαρις, which (like *grace* in Fr.) ſignifies not only a favour beſtowed, but thanks returned; and maintaining that the ſenſe is, that God gives more *grace* to thoſe who are thankful for that formerly received; a poſition which, however juſt, it requires an extraordinary turn of imagination to diſcover in this paſſage. Is it, as Dod. Weſ. and Wy. render it, *grace upon grace,* that is, grace added to grace? I ſhould not diſlike this interpretation, if this meaning of the prepoſition αντι in Scripture, were well ſupported. It always there denotes, if I miſtake not, *inſtead of, anſwering to,* or *in return for.* Is it a mere pleonaſm? Does it mean (as Grotius would have it) *grace gratuitous?* I do not ſay that ſuch pleonaſtic expreſſions are unexampled in ſacred writ; but I do ſay, that this ſenſe given to the idiom is unexampled. The word in ſuch caſes is δωρεαν, as Rom. iii. 4. Δικαιουμενοι δωρεαν τη αυτου χαριτι. If, inſtead of giving ſcope to fancy, we attend to the context and the conſtruction of the words, we ſhall not need to wander ſo far in queſt of the meaning. In verſe 14th we are informed, that *the word became incarnate, and ſojourned amongſt us full of grace and truth.* It is plain that the 15th verſe, containing the Baptiſt's declaration, muſt be underſtood as a parentheſis. And it actually is underſtood ſo by all expoſitors; inaſmuch as they make αυτου here refer to λογος in verſe 14th. The Evangeliſt reſuming the

subject which, (for the sake of inserting John's testimony) he had interrupted, tells us that all we his disciples, particularly his apostles, have received of his *fulness*. But of what was he full? It had been said expressly, that he was *full of grace*. When, therefore, the historian brings this additional clause concerning *grace* in explanation of the former (for on all hands the conjunction και is here admitted to be explanatory), is it not manifestly his intention to inform us, that of every *grace* wherewith he was filled, his disciples received a share? The pronoun αυτυ, which occurs after πληρωματος, must be understood as repeated after χαριτος, the omission whereof in such cases is so common as scarcely to be considered as an ellipsis. I shall give a few similar examples out of many which might be produced, Mt. xii. 50. αυτος μυ αδελφος, και αδελφη, και μητηρ εστι; where the pronoun μυ is prefixed to the first noun, and left to be supplied by the sense before the other two. 1 Tim. vi. 1. ινα μη το ονομα του Θυ και η διδασκαλια βλασφημηται; where the sense requires the pronoun αυτυ, or the repetition του Θυ after διδασκαλια: and to give one example from this Gospel, ch. vi. 52. πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα φαγειν; where, if we do not supply from the sense αυτυ after σαρκα, we shall give a very different meaning to the question, and one perfectly unsuited to the context. But to return to the words under examination; when the immediate connection between the 16th and the 14th verses is attended to, the meaning of the clause is equally obvious as that of any of the foregoing examples. *The word incarnate*, says the Apostle, *resided amongst us full of grace and truth; and of his fulness we all have received, even grace for his grace;* that is, of every grace or celestial gift, conferred above measure upon him, his disciples have received a portion, according to their measure. If there should remain a doubt, whether this was the sense of the passage, the words immediately following seem calculated to remove it. *For the law was given by Moses, the grace and the truth came by Jesus Christ.* Here the Evangelist intimates that Jesus Christ was as truly the channel of divine grace to his disciples, as Moses had been of the knowledge of God's law to the Israelites. I am happy to find that in this criticism I concur with the learned Dr. Clerk.

17. *The grace and the truth*, η χαρις και η αληθεια. E. T. *grace and truth.* The article in this place ought by no means to be omitted. These nouns are often used emphatically as names for the Gospel dispensation; and are here contrasted as such to ο νομος *the law*, the name given to the Mosaic economy. Η χαρις sometimes with, and sometimes without, an addition, is thus, if I mistake not, employed in these and other passages, which the reader may consult at his leisure; Acts, xiii. 43. xx. 32. 2 Cor. vi. 1. Gal. ii. 21. v. 4. 2 Thess. i. 12. Tit. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 12.; and η αληθεια in the following, J. viii. 32. xvi. 13. xvii. 17. 2 Cor. iv. 2. xiii. 8. Gal. iii. 1. v. 7. Eph. iv. 21. 2 Thess. ii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 15. iii. 8. iv. 4. Tit. i. 14. Heb. x. 26. Ja. v. 19. 1 Pet. i. 22. 2. Pet. ii. 2. 1 J. ii. 21. 2 J. 2. 3 J. 8.

18. *That is in the bosom of the Father*, ch. iii. 13. N.

19. *Now this is the testimony of John*, και αυτη εστιν η μαρτυρια του Ιωαννυ. A little attention to the words in the orignal will convince the judicious reader, that there ought to be a full stop here, and that this ought to be read as a distinct sentence. The next sentence, which includes the rest of the 19th verse, and the whole of the 20th, derives both simplicity and perspicuity from this manner of dividing.

21. *Who then? τι υν;* E. T. *What then?* Between the two questions, *What art thou?* and *Who art thou?* put on such an occasion as the present, by such men as the messengers of the Pharisees, to such a person as John, there is no imaginable difference, in respect of meaning. Accordingly the same answer is equally adapted to either question. But there is in our language an essential difference in meaning between the words *What then?* and *Who then?* The former, though it would be readily denominated a literal version of the Gr. τι υν, conveys to our mind a sense totally different; the latter, with an inconsiderable difference in point of form, entirely coincides in import with the original expression; for in such cases, as was just now observed, *what* and *who* are equivalent. But in combining words into a phrase, the result is often different from what we should expect from the words, of which the phrase is combined, considered severally. And this is one of the many reasons which render a literal version often a very unjust as well as obscure version. As to the point we are here concerned with, *what then?* has acquired an idiomatical acceptation which answers exactly to the Fr. *Qu' inferez vous de la? What would you infer from that?* than which nothing could be more foreign to the purpose. I am surprised that all the later Eng. versions, except the An. who omits the question entirely, have here implicitly followed the E. T. The foreign translators have in general done justice to the sense.

21. *Art thou Elijah? He said, I am not.* There is here an apparent contradiction to the words of our Lord concerning John, Mt. xi. 14. *This is the Elijah that was to come.* But Jesus, in the passage quoted, evidently refers to the words of Malachi, his purpose being to inform his disciples that John was Elijah, in the meaning of that Prophet, and that the Prophet's prediction was accomplished in the Baptist, inasmuch as he came in the spirit and power of Elijah. But when the question was propoſed to John, the laws of truth required that he should answer it, according to the sense wherein the words were used by the propoſers. He could not otherwise have been vindicated from the charge of equivocating. The intended purport

port of their queſtion, he well knew, was, whether he acknowledged that he was individually the Prophet Elijah returned from heaven to ſojourn again upon the earth; for in this manner they explained the prediction. To this he could not, without falſehood, anſwer in the affirmative.

21. *Art thou the prophet?* ὁ προφητης ει συ; E. T. *Art thou that prophet?* The latter expreſſion is evidently unſuitable to our idiom, unleſs ſome prophet had been named in the preceding part of the converſation, to whom the pronoun *that* could refer. In this our tranſlators have too implicitly followed Be. who ſays, *Es tu propheta ille?* Not that I condemn Be. for this verſion. I think, on the contrary, that as the article was quite neceſſary here, and this was the only way of ſupplying it in La. he did right. Accordingly Er. and Leo de Juda had done the ſame before him. But there was no occaſion for this method in Eng. which has articles. I own, at the ſame time, that in the way wherein the queſtion is expreſſed in the Vul. and in Caſ. the moſt natural verſion would be, *Art thou a prophet?* which is quite a different queſtion: nay, I am perſuaded that, if this had been the queſtion, the Baptiſt's anſwer would not have been in the negative. Our Lord, we know, calls him (Mt. xi. 11.) *a prophet than whom there had not ariſen a greater* under the Moſaic diſpenſation. Beſides, the Gr. is quite explicit, and the article here perfectly well ſupported. It is alſo repeated with the word προφητης, verſe 25th, and of the beſt authority, notwithſtanding the diſſent of Heinſius and Mill. Yet ſome tranſlators, even from the Gr. have rendered the queſtion indefinitely. Of this number are Lu. and Beau. among foreigners, and of Eng. tranſlators, the An. Dod. and Wor. To me it is evident, both from what is ſaid here, and from other hints in the N. T. that there was at that time a general expectation in the people, of ſome great prophet, beſide Elijah, who was ſoon to appear, and who was well known by the emphatical appellation *the prophet*, without any addition or deſcription. Ch. vi. 40, 41. *the prophet*, is diſtinguiſhed from the Meſſiah, as he is here from Elijah.

23. *I am he whoſe voice proclaimeth in the wilderneſs,* εγω φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω. E. T. *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderneſs.* In ſuch declarations the general purport is alone regarded by the ſpeaker; the words ought not, therefore, to be too grammatically interpreted. John, inſtead of giving a deſcription of his own character and office, refers thoſe who queſtioned him, to the words of the Prophet Iſaiah, in which they would find it. What he here ſays of himſelf, is to be underſtood no otherwiſe than we underſtand what Mt. ſays of him, ch. iii. 3. Interpretations to be formed from the manifeſt ſcope, not from the ſyntactic ſtructure, of a ſentence, are not unfrequent in Scripture. Thus, Rev. i. 12. Επεστρεψα βλεπειν την φωνην, literally, *I turned to ſee the voice.*—The like may be obſerved in ſome of the parables, as Mt. xiii. 24. and 45. In one of theſe places the kingdom of heaven is, according to the ſcope of the paſſage, compared, to a field; but, according to the letter, to the proprietor: in the other it is compared, apparently to a merchant, but in fact to a pearl. Several other inſtances occur in the Goſpels. As on ſuch points, the genius of modern languages is more faſtidious than that of the ancient, it would ſavour more of the ſuperſtitious and ſervile ſpirit of the ſynagogue, or of the κακοζηλια of an Arias, or an Aquila, than of the liberal ſpirit of our religion, to inſiſt on a verſion of theſe paſſages ſcrupulouſly literal.

28. *Bethany*, E. T. *Bethabara.* In the common Gr. it is Βηθαβαρα. But the MSS. which read Βηθανια, are, both in number and in value, more than a counterpoiſe to thoſe in which we find the vulgar reading. Add to theſe the Vul. the Sax. and both the Sy. verſions, together with Nonnus' Gr. paraphraſe of this Goſpel, which is entitled to be put on the footing of an ancient tranſlation. Alſo ſeveral ancient authors, and ſome of the beſt editions, read ſo. There is ground to think that the change of *Bethany* into *Bethabara*, took its riſe from a conjecture of Origen, who, becauſe its ſituation mentioned here does not ſuit what is ſaid of Bethany where Lazarus and his ſiſters lived, changed it into Bethabara, the place mentioned, Judg. vii. 24. where our tranſlators have rendered it Beth-barah. But one thing is certain, that, in ſeveral inſtances, the ſame name was given to different places, and this *Bethany* ſeems here to be expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from another of the name, by the addition περαν του Ιορδανου, *upon the Jordan.* It adds alſo to the probability of the reading here adopted, that *Bethany*, by its etymology, ſignifies a place or houſe cloſe by a ferry.

33. *I had not known him.* This has been thought by ſome not perfectly conſiſtent with what L. acquaints us, concerning the connection of their families, and particularly with what we are told, Mt. iii. 14; where we find that John, when Jeſus came to him to be baptized, modeſtly declined the office, and freely acknowledged the ſuperiority of the latter. But there is no abſurdity in ſuppoſing that this was in conſequence of what the Baptiſt knew concerning our Lord's perſonal character, his ſuperior wiſdom and ſanctity. Nay, he might have known further, that he was a Prophet, and highly honoured of God, and yet not have known, or even ſuſpected, that he was the Meſſiah, till the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt at his baptiſm. All that is affirmed here is, that, till this evidence was given him, he did not know him to be the Meſſiah. The ſame ſolution of this difficulty is given, I find, by Mr. Palmer. See his letter prefixed to Prieſtley's Harmony.

39. *A word equivalent to Chriſt,* ὁ εστι μεθερμηνευομενον ὁ Χριστος. E. T. *Which is, being interpreted, the Chriſt.* In all the beſt MSS. and editions, the article in Gr. before Χριστος is wanting. As the intention here, is ſolely

ſolely to point out the coincidence of the two names, we muſt be ſenſible that it was not neceſſary.

43. *Cephas, which denoteth the ſame as Peter,* κηφας ὁ ἑρμηνευεται πετρος. E. T. *Cephas which is by interpretation a ſtone.* I have put *which denoteth the ſame as Peter,* in a different character, as the words of the hiſtorian, and not of our Lord. We ought to conſider that this Evangeliſt wrote his Goſpel in a Grecian city of Aſia Minor, and, for this reaſon, was the more careful to tranſlate into Gr. the Heb. or Chal. names, given for a ſpecial purpoſe, whereof they were expreſſive. There was the greater reaſon for doing ſo in the two caſes occurring in this and the preceding verſe, as the Gr. names were become familiar to the Aſiatic converts, who were unacquainted with the Oriental names. The ſacred writer had a twofold view in it; firſt, to explain the import of the name; ſecondly, to prevent his readers from miſtaking the perſon ſpoken of. They all knew who, as well as what, was meant by χριστος; but not by the Heb. word *Meſſiah.* In like manner, they knew who was called Peter, but might very readily miſtake Cephas for ſome other perſon. When a ſignificant name was given to a man or woman, it was cuſtomary to tranſlate the name, when he or ſhe was ſpoken of in a different tongue. Thus, Thomas was in Gr. Didymus; and Tabitha was Dorcas. Now, it deſerves our notice, that a tranſlator from the Gr. can, for the moſt part, anſwer only one of the two purpoſes above mentioned. The Gr. to thoſe who cannot read it, is equally unintelligible with the Heb. To give the Gr. name, therefore, to the Eng. reader, is not to explain the Heb. For this reaſon, the interpreter ought to conſider which of the two purpoſes ſuits beſt the ſcope of the place, and to be directed by this conſideration in his verſion. The other purpoſe he may ſupply by means of the margin. To me it appears of more importance, in theſe inſtances, to be aſcertained of the ſameneſs of the perſon denominated both Meſſiah and Chriſt, and alſo of him called Cephas and Peter, than to know that the two former words ſignify *anointed,* and the two latter *rock.* I have, therefore, taken the method adopted by the Eng. tranſlators as to the former, but not as to the latter. They have retained *Chriſt* in the verſion, and put *anointed* on the margin. The word *Petros* they have tranſlated *a ſtone.* The ſame way ought certainly to have been followed in both. As far as I can judge of the ſcope of the paſſage, it is clearly the intention of the writer, on the firſt mention of ſome principal perſons in his hiſtory, in order to prevent all miſtakes that may, in the ſequel, ariſe about them, to give their different names at once, with this intimation, that they are of the ſame import, and belong to the ſame perſon. Thus, we have here, in one verſe, all the names by which this Apoſtle is diſtinguiſhed—Simon, ſon of Jona, Cephas, and Peter. Again, if the ſacred penman had more in view, to acquaint us with the ſignification of the name, than to prevent our miſtaking the perſon, he would probably have tranſlated Cephas into Gr. πετρα, not πετρος. The former is always uſed in the N. T. and in the Sep. for *a rock,* and never the latter. I acknowledge that πετρος, in Gr. authors, and πετρα, are ſynonymous; but, in the uſe of the ſacred writers, πετρος is invariably, and πετρα never, a proper name. Nay, in the paſſage, Mt. xvi. 18. wherein the ſignification of the word is pointed out, as the reaſon of aſſigning the name, the word is changed in the explanation given—συ ει πετρος· και επι ταυτη τη πετρα. This would not have been done, if πετρος had ever been uſed by them for *a rock.* Accordingly, in the Sy. verſion, there is no change of the word; Cephas, or rather Kepha, ſerving equally for both. The change was evidently made in Gr. for the ſake of the gender; πετρα, being feminine, was not a ſuitable name for a man. The word πετρος, however, being here preferred by the Evangeliſt to πετρα, ſhows evidently that it was more his view to indicate the perſon, than to explain the name. So the author of the Vul. underſtood it, who renders the words *quod interpretatur Petrus* not *petra.* Let it be obſerved further, that this Apoſtle is never afterwards named by this Evangeliſt *Cephas,* but always Peter. Now, in conſequence of excluding that name out of this verſe, the very purpoſe, as I imagine, of John's introducing the name into it, is defeated; as, from this Goſpel at leaſt, the mere Eng. reader would not diſcover, when he hears afterwards of Peter, that it was the ſame perſon whom our Saviour, on this occaſion, denominated Cephas. It muſt, therefore, be more eligible to preſerve the names in the verſion, and give their import in the margin, than converſely; unleſs we will ſay, that it is of more conſequence to know the etymology of the names, than to be ſecured againſt miſtaking the perſons to whom they are appropriated. I ſhall only add, that, by a ſtrange felicity in ſome tongues, both purpoſes are anſwered in the tranſlation, as well as in the original. *Pierre,* in Fr. hits both ſenſes exactly; and in La. and Itn. the affinity in the names is as great as between πετρος and πετρα, in Gr.

51. *Thou believeſt,* πιστευεις. E. T. *Believeſt thou?* The words are capable of being tranſlated either way. I prefer the more ſimple method of rendering, which is by affirmation, when neither the form of the ſentence, nor any expreſſion of ſurpriſe or emotion, leads us to conſider it as an interrogation.

52. *Hereafter,* απ' αρτι. There is nothing anſwering to this in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Arm. verſions. The words are wanting in but one MS. of no great account.

CHAP. II.

4. *Woman.* That this compellation was not, in thoſe days, accounted diſreſpectful, has been fully evinced

evinced by critics from the beſt authorities. We find in this Goſpel (ch. xix. 26.) our Lord addreſſing his mother by this title, on a very moving occaſion, on which he ſhowed her the moſt tender affection and regard.

4. *What haſt thou to do with me?* Mt. viii. 29. N. It was no doubt our Lord's intention, in theſe words, gently to ſuggeſt, that, in what concerned his office, earthly parents had no authority over him. In other things, he had been ſubject to them. Some tranſlators have been rather over-ſolicitous to accommodate the expreſſion to modern forms of civility. The An. *Leave that affair to me; is not that my concern?* Hey. *What is there between me and you?* This, I ſuppoſe, has been thought a ſofter expreſſion of the ſenſe than that which is given in the E. T. It is certainly more obſcure, and does not ſuit our idiom. But it is a literal verſion of the phraſe, by which the Fr. tranſlators render our Lord's expreſſion—*Qu' y a-t-il entre vous et moi?* Weſ. *What is it to me and thee?* This, at firſt ſight, appears preferable to the reſt, becauſe the moſt literal verſion. But, as Biſhop Pearce well obſerves, had that been the Evangeliſt's meaning, he would have written τι προς εμε και σε; as, in ch. xxi. 23. τι προς σε; *what is that to thee?* and, Mt. xxvii. 4. τι προς ἡμας; *what is that to us?* Let me add, that τι εμοι και σοι, as it is elliptic, is evidently a proverbial or idiomatic expreſſion. Now, the meaning of ſuch is always collected from the cuſtomary application of the words taken together, and not from combining the ſignifications of the words taken ſeverally. The common verſion ſuits the phraſe in every place where it occurs —Weſley's does not; accordingly, in other places, he renders it differently. Another reaſon againſt this manner is, becauſe the ſenſe conveyed by it is a worſe ſenſe, and not ſuitable to the ſpirit of our Lord's inſtructions. 'What is it to us, that they want wine? 'That concerns them only; let them ſee to it.' This way of talking appears rather ſelfiſh, and does not favour of that tender ſympathy which our religion ſo warmly recommends, whereby the intereſts and the concerns of others, their joys and their ſorrows, are made our own.

6. *Baths*, μετρητας. E. T. *Firkins*. As to the impropriety of introducing, into a verſion of Scripture, the name of a veſſel ſo modern as *firkin*, ſee Diſſ. VIII. P. I. § 9, &c. I have preferred here the Heb. meaſure, *bath*, as the common ſtandard uſed in reckoning the capacity of their veſſels; eſpecially as I find the Heb. word בת rendered μετρητης, in the Sep. 2 Chron. iv. 5. I acknowledge, at the ſame time, that this evidence is not deciſive; but I have not found any thing better, in ſupport of a different opinion. The Seventy, indeed, have, in 1 Kings, xviii. 32. rendered סאה *ſeah*, which was equal to one third of the bath, in the ſame manner; but, as the words *ſeah* and *ephah* were, with the Hebrews, peculiarly the names of dry meaſures, and never applied to liquids, we cannot have recourſe to that paſſage for the interpretation of an expreſſion relating ſolely to liquors. Some think that, as μετρητης was alſo the name of an Attic meaſure, the Evangeliſt (moſt of whoſe readers were probably Greeks) muſt have referred to it, as beſt known in that country. There are other ſuppoſitions made; but hardly any thing more than conjecture has been advanced in favour of any of them. It ought not to be diſſembled, that, in moſt of the explanations which have been given of the paſſage, the quantity of liquor appears ſo great, as to reflect an improbability on the interpretation. I ſhall only ſay, that the E. T. is more liable to this objection than the preſent verſion. The *firkin* contains nine gallons; the *bath* is commonly rated at ſeven and a half, ſome ſay but four and a half; in which caſe the amount of the whole, as repreſented here, is but half of what the E. T. makes it. The quantity thus reduced, will not, perhaps, be thought ſo enormous, when we conſider, firſt, the length of time, commonly a week, ſpent in feaſting on ſuch occaſions (of which time, poſſibly, one half was not yet over), and the great concourſe of people which they were wont to aſſemble.

For the Jewiſh rites of cleanſing, κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων. E. T. *After the manner of the purifying of the Jews*. This expreſſion is rather obſcure and indefinite. There can be no doubt that, in ſuch caſes as the preſent, κατα is equivalent to εις, and denotes the end or purpoſe. So the Sy. interpreter has underſtood it.

10. *When the gueſts have drunk largely*, ὁταν μεθυσθωσι. Vul. *Cum inebriati fuerint*. The Gr. word, frequently in Scripture, and ſometimes in other writings, denotes no more than *to drink freely*, but not to intoxication.

14. *Cattle*, βοας. E. T. *Oxen*. Βους in Gr. in like manner as *bos* in La. is the name of the ſpecies, and therefore of the common gender. It includes alike *bulls*, *cows*, and *oxen*. Thus, Gen. xli. 2, 3. the *kine* in Pharao's dream are termed βοες by the Seventy—ἑπτα βοες καλαι—αλλαι ἑπτα βοες αισχραι—and in the Vul. they are named *boves*; but no perſon who underſtands Eng. would call them *oxen*. And though a herd may ſometimes be ſo denominated, becauſe the *oxen* make the greater part, it could never, with propriety, be uſed of cattle amongſt which there was not even a ſingle *ox*. Let it be obſerved, that the merchandize, which was carried on in the outermoſt court of the temple, a very unſuitable place, without doubt, was under the pretext of being neceſſary for the accommodation of the worſhippers, that they might be ſupplied with the victims requiſite for the altar; and, where payments in money were neceſſary, that in exchange for the foreign coin they may have brought from their reſpective places of abode, they might be furniſhed with ſuch as the law and cuſtom required. Now, by the law of Moſes, no mutilated beaſt, and conſequently no *ox*, could be offered in ſacrifice to God. Yet all the Engliſh tranſlators I have ſeen,

render βοας here *oxen*. In like manner, all the Fr. translators I am acquainted with, except Beau. who says, *des toureaux*, fall into the same mistake, rendering the word *des bœufs*.

20. *Forty and six years was this temple in building*, τεσσαρακοντα και εξ ετεσιν ωκοδομηθη ο ναος ουτος. Dod. Hey. and Wor. say, *hath been*, instead of *was*, proceeding on the supposition, that those who made this reply alluded to the additional buildings which the temple had received, and which had been begun by Herod, and continued by those who succeeded him in the government of Judea, to the time then present. But let it be observed, that the Jews never did, nor do, to this day, speak of more than two temples possessed by their fathers; the first built by Solomon, the second by Zerubbabel. The great additions made by Herod, were considered as intended only for decorating and repairing the edifice, not for rebuilding it; for, in fact, Zerubbabel's temple had not then been destroyed. Nor need we, I think, puzzle ourselves to make out exactly the *forty-six years* spoken of. Those men were evidently in the humour of exaggerating, in order to represent to the people as absurd, what they had immediately heard advanced by our Lord. In this disposition, we may believe, they would not hesitate to include the years in which the work was interrupted, among the years employed in building.

22. *That he had said this*, οτι τουτο ελεγεν. In the common editions, αυτοις, *to them*, is added. But this word is wanting in a very great number of MSS. amongst which are several of the highest account. It is not in some of the best editions, nor in the following versions: the Vul. either of the Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. Ger. Tigurine, old Belgic. It has not been admitted by the best critics, ancient or modern.

22. *They understood the Scripture and the word*, επιστευσαν τη γραφη και τω λογω. E. T. *They believed the Scripture and the word*. Πιστευειν, in the sacred writers, sometimes signifies, not so much *to believe*, as *to apprehend* aright. In this sense, it is once and again employed by this writer in particular. It is not insinuated here, that the disciples did not, before this time, *believe* the Scripture, or their Master's word; but that they did not, till now, *rightly apprehend* the meaning of either, in relation to this subject. Another instance of this application of the verb πιστευω, we have, ch. iii. 12.

CHAP. III.

3. *Unless a man be born again*, εαν μη τις γεννηθη ανωθεν. Hey. *Unless a man be born from above*. The word ανωθεν will, no doubt, admit either interpretation. But that the common version is here preferable, is evident from the answer given by Nicodemus, which shows, that he understood it no otherwise than as a second birth. And let it be observed, that, in the Chal. language, spoken by our Lord, there is not the same ambiguity which we find here in the Gr. The word occurs in this sense, Gal. iv. 9. The oldest versions concur in this interpretation. Vul. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit denuo*. With this, Cas. and Be. perfectly agree in sense. Er. indeed, says, *Nisi quis natus fuerit e supernis*. In this he is followed, as usual, by the translator of Zu. The Sy. is conformable to the Vul. So are also the Ger. the Itn. and all the Fr. versions, Romish and Protestant. All the Eng. translators also, except Hey. render the words in the same manner.

3. *He cannot discern the reign of God*, ου δυναται ιδειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου. E. T. *He cannot see the kingdom of God*. The common explanation that is given of the word *see*, in this passage, is *enjoy, share in*. Accordingly, it is considered as synonymous with *enter*, verse 5. Though I admit, in a great measure, the truth of this exposition, I do not think it comprehends the whole of what the words imply. It is true, that *to see*, often denotes *to enjoy*, or *to suffer*, as suits the nature of the object seen. Thus, *to see death*, is used for *to die*; *to see life*, for *to live*; *to see good days*, for *to enjoy good days*; and *to see corruption*, for *to suffer corruption*. But this sense of the word *seeing*, is limited to a very few phrases, of which those now mentioned are the chief. I have not, however, found an example, setting this passage aside as questionable, of ιδειν βασιλειαν, for *enjoying a kingdom*, or partaking therein. Let it be observed further, that the form of the expression is not that used in threatening, which is always by the future, or by some periphrasis of like import. Thus, as in the same chapter, verse 36. ου οψεται ζωην is denounced as a threat, the expression would probably have been here, had that been the scope, ου οψεται την βασιλειαν του Θεου. Whereas, the verb δυναμαι, with the negative particle, denotes, I imagine, an unfitness or incapacity in regard to the action or enjoyment mentioned. I understand, therefore, the word ιδειν to imply here, what it often implies, *to perceive, to discern*, not by the bodily organ, but by the eye of the mind. *To see*, for to conceive, to understand, is a metaphor familiar to all classes of people, and to be found in every language. The import, therefore, in my apprehension, is this: 'The 'man who is not regenerated, or born again of water 'and spirit, is not in a capacity of perceiving the reign 'of God, though it were commenced. Though the 'kingdom of the saints on the earth were already 'established, the unregenerate would not discern it, 'because it is a spiritual, not a worldly kingdom, and 'capable of being no otherwise than spiritually dis- 'cerned. And as the kingdom itself would remain 'unknown to him, he could not share in the blessings 'enjoyed by the subjects of it.' This last clause appears to be the import of that expression, verse 5th, *he cannot enter the kingdom of God*. The two declarations, therefore, are not synonymous, but related; and the latter is consequent upon the former. The same

ſame ſentiment occurs, 1 Cor. ii. 14. So far I agree with the common expoſition, that, *to ſee*, means here *to enjoy*; for a great part of the enjoyment of thoſe born of the ſpirit, conſiſts, doubtleſs, in their ſpiritual diſcernment of things divine, or reſults from it. Let it be obſerved further, that the ſenſe here given to the words makes the connection and pertinency of the whole diſcourſe much clearer. It is repreſented as our Lord's anſwer to what Nicodemus had ſaid to him. Now, though I acknowledge that the verb αποκρινεσθαι does not, in the N. T. always imply ſtrictly what the verb *to anſwer* implies with us (it being frequently uſed, agreeably to the Heb. idiom, of one who begins a converſation), yet, when it is preceded by the words of a different ſpeaker, which, though not a queſtion, ſeem to require ſome notice, we ſhall not often err in rendering it *to anſwer*. Such a caſe is the preſent. Nicodemus had acquainted our Lord what, in brief, his faith was concerning him, and the foundation on which it was built. His faith was, that Jeſus was a teacher whom God had ſpecially commiſſioned, in other words a Prophet; and his reaſon for thinking ſo, was the miracles which he performed. This, we may reſt aſſured, from what he ſays, when evidently diſpoſed to ſay the moſt he could, was the ſum of his belief at that time concerning Jeſus. No mention is made of the Meſſiah, or of his reign upon the earth. It is in reference to this defect, in the words of Nicodemus, partly, as it were, to account for his ſilence on this article, and partly to point out to him the proper ſource of this knowledge, that our Lord anſwers, by obſerving that, unleſs a man be enlightened by the ſpirit, or born anew, not to the light of this world, but to that of the heavenly, he cannot diſcern either the ſigns of the Meſſiah, or the nature of his government. For let it be obſerved, that Nicodemus, though more candid than any Jew of his rank at that time, and willing to weigh, impartially, the evidence of a divine miſſion, even in one who was deteſted by the ruling powers; was not altogether ſuperior to thoſe prejudices concerning the ſecular kingdom of the Meſſiah, which ſeem to have been univerſal among the Jews of that age. It is a very fine, and, at the ſame time, a very juſt obſervation of Cyril, that our Lord's reprehenſions, in this converſation, in ſome reſpects more ſevere than ordinary, are to be underſtood as directed, not ſo much againſt Nicodemus, as againſt the guides and inſtructors of the age, the claſs to which Nicodemus belonged. Auguſtine is of opinion, that it was neceſſary thus to humble the ſpiritual pride of the Phariſee, the conceited ſuperiority to the vulgar in things ſacred, which is the greateſt obſtruction to divine knowledge; that he might be prepared for receiving, with all humility, the illumination of the ſpirit.

5. *Unleſs a man be born of water and ſpirit*, εαν μη τις γεννηθη εξ ὑδατος και πνευματος. Vul. *Niſi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et ſpiritu ſancto.* For neither of theſe variations in the Vul. *renatus* for *natus*, and *ſancto* added to *ſpiritu*, do we find any authority from MSS. or (if we except the Sax.) from verſions.

. 2. It may be proper to obſerve, in paſſing, that though our Lord, in this account of regeneration, joins *water* and *ſpirit* together, he does not, in contraſting it with natural generation, verſe 6th, mention *the water* at all, but oppoſes ſimply *the ſpirit* to *the fleſh*, as the original principles, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, of thoſe different ſorts of birth. Again, in what he ſays, verſe 8th, of the manner wherein this change is effected, the regenerate are diſtinguiſhed ſolely by the words *born of the ſpirit*.

8. *The wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof; but knoweſt not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; ſo it is with every one who is born of the ſpirit*—Το πνευμα οπυ θελει πνει, και την φωνην αυτυ ακυεις, αλλ' υκ οιδας πυθεν ερχεται και πυ υπαγει· ὑτως εϛι πας ὁ γεγεννημενος εκ τυ πνευματος. Vul. Er. Zu. *Spiritus, ubi vult, ſpirat, et vocem ejus audis, ſed neſcis unde veniat aut quò vadat: ſic eſt omnis qui natus eſt ex ſpiritu.* It is worthy of remark, that as, in the Gr. and in the Vul. the ſame word, in this paſſage, ſignifies both *wind* and *ſpirit*, the illuſtration is expreſſed with more energy than it is poſſible to give it in thoſe languages which do not admit the ſame ambiguity. The Sy. does admit it, and is an exact verſion of the words, in the full extent they have in the original. As, in moſt modern tongues, it is neceſſary to recur to different words for explaining the ſame term, in the beginning of the verſe and in the end, this gives a degree of obſcurity, and an appearance of incoherency, to the verſion, which the original has not. The Fr. tranſlators from the Vul. as Si. Sa. and P. R. have employed the word *l'eſprit* in both places. *L'eſprit ſouffle où il veut, et vous entendez bien ſa voix.* This ſounds oddly in our ears. It would be ſtill worſe to render πνευμα, *wind*, in both places. But to preſerve the ſimilitude, and expreſs the ſenſe with ſufficient perſpicuity, in a modern language, would require more of the manner of paraphraſe, than is thought ſufferable in a tranſlator. As this manner, however, is not offenſive in a note, I ſhall give what appears to me the purport of verſes 7th and 8th. 'Nor is there,' as if he had ſaid, 'any thing in this 'either abſurd or unintelligible. The wind, which, 'in Hebrew, is expreſſed by the ſame word as ſpirit, 'ſhall ſerve for an example. It is inviſible; we hear 'the noiſe it makes, but cannot diſcover what occaſions 'its riſe or its fall. It is known to us ſolely by its ef'fects. Juſt ſo it is with this ſecond birth. The ſpirit 'himſelf, the great agent, is inviſible, his manner of 'operating is beyond our diſcovery; but the reality 'of his operation is perceived by the effects produced 'on the diſpoſition and life of the regenerate.'

10. *The teacher of Iſrael*, ὁ διδασκαλος τυ Ισραηλ. E. T. *A maſter of Iſrael.* The article here is remarkable; the more ſo, becauſe there does not appear to be a ſingle Gr. copy which omits it. As a member of

of the ſanhedrim, Nicodemus had a ſuperintendency in what concerned religious inſtruction, and might, on that account, have been called *a teacher of Iſrael;* but it is probably in order to intimate to us a diſtinguiſhed fame for abilities in this reſpect, that he is ſtyled, by way of eminence, ὁ διδασκαλος. It appears ſo particular, that it ought not to be overlooked by the tranſlator. Be. after Er. has properly diſtinguiſhed it in La. which has not articles, by the pronoun, *magiſter ille Iſraelis.* The only other verſion I know, wherein attention has been paid to the article in this place, is Diodati's who ſays, *il dottore d'Iſrael.* The reproof conveyed in this verſe is thought to have an alluſion to certain figures of ſpeech, pretty ſimilar to thoſe uſed on this occaſion by our Lord, and not unfrequent among the rabbies, who conſidered the baptiſm of proſelytes as a new birth. To this ſort of language, therefore, it might be thought extraordinary that Nicodemus ſhould be ſo much a ſtranger. I think, however, that our Lord's cenſure rather relates to his being ſo entirely unacquainted with that effuſion of the ſpirit which would take place under the Meſſiah, and which had been ſo clearly foretold by the Prophets.

12. *If ye underſtand not.* Ch. ii. 22. [2] N.

13. *Whoſe abode is heaven,* ὁ ων εν τω ουρανω. E. T. *Which is in heaven.* Two MSS. of no name, read εκ του ουρανου. But as this reading is ſupported by no ancient author or tranſlator, it has no authority. The common reading is not unſuitable to the ſtyle of the writer. Ὁ ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος, ch. i. 18. is a ſimilar expreſſion. Both are intended to denote, rather what is habitual and characteriſtic of the perſon, than what obtains at a particular inſtant. By the expreſſion, ὁ ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος, is meant, not only 'who is the ſpecial object of the father's love,' but 'who is admitted to his moſt ſecret counſels.' By ὁ ων εν τω ουρανω, is meant, 'whoſe abode, whoſe re-'ſidence, whoſe home is there.' This is agreeable, in import, to the interpretation given by Nonnus:

——Ὁς αστεροεντι μελαθρω
Πατριον ὑδας εχων, αιωνιος αιθερα ναιει.

14. *As Moſes placed on high the ſerpent,* καθως Μωσης ὑψωσε τον οφιν. E. T. *As Moſes lifted up the ſerpent.* Unleſs we knew the ſtory referred to, which is related, Numb. xxi. we ſhould not rightly underſtand the meaning of the expreſſion uſed in the E. T. *To liſt up a ſerpent,* implies no more than to take it from off the ground, and is conſequently far from expreſſing the import of the Gr. word ὑψωσις.

20, 21. In theſe two concluding verſes of this converſation, our Saviour glances, as it were in paſſing, at the impropriety of Nicodemus' conduct in coming to conſult him in the ſilence of the night, as one conſcious of doing what he ought to be aſhamed of, not as one who acted in obedience to the call of duty. To this the attention of a conſcientious man would be more ſtrongly awakened, as the preferring darkneſs to light is declared to be the ground of the condemnation of infidels.

21. *That it may appear that his actions are agreeable to God,* ινα φανερωθη αυτου τα εργα, οτι εν Θεω εστιν ειργασμενα. E. T. *That his deeds may be made manifeſt that they are wrought in God.* Vul. *Ut manifeſtentur opera ejus quia in Deo ſunt facta.* Inſtead of *in Deo,* Er. ſays, *per Deum,* Zu. *cum Deo,* and Caſ. *divinitus.* Be. has hit the ſenſe better, rendering it *ſecundum Deum.* Gro. juſtly obſerves, that in ſuch caſes εν is uſed for κατα, and gives for an example εν κυριω, 1 Cor. vii. 39. In this Be. has been followed by Dio. who ſays *ſecondo Iddio,* the G. E. *according to God,* and the G. F. *ſelon Dieu.* In the ſame manner, both L. Cl. and Beau. tranſlate the words. I may alſo add, Si. who, though not chargeable with partiality to Be. and though tranſlating from the Vul. has here adapted the method of the Geneveſe interpreter, and rendered it *ſelon Dieu.* I have expreſſed the ſame ſenſe with as much plainneſs as our idiom will admit.

25. *John's diſciples had a diſpute with a Jew,* εγενετο ζητησις εκ των Ιωαννου μετα Ιουδαιου. E. T. *There aroſe a queſtion between ſome of John's diſciples and the Jews.* There is no ellipſis here, εκ being uſed for απο. Though the common editions read Ιουδαιων, the greater number of MSS. amongſt which are ſome of the moſt valuable, ſome ancient expoſitors alſo and critics, read Ιουδαιω in the ſingular. With this agree both the Sy. verſions. To this reading alſo Nonnus the Gr. verſifier and paraphraſt, who commonly keeps pretty cloſe to the ſenſe, has alſo given his ſanction:

Ερις δε τις αμφι καθαρμω
Επλεκτο μυσιπολοισιν Ιωαννεω μαθηταις
Ἑβραιη μετα φωτος.

Add to theſe ſome of our beſt modern critics, as Gro. Cocceius, Ham. Mill, and Wet.

[2] *About purification,* περι καθαρισμου: that is, as appears from the ſequel, about baptiſms and other legal ablutions.

29. *The bridegroom is he who hath the bride,* ὁ εχων την νυμφην, νυμφιος εστιν. E. T. *He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.* As the manifeſt intention here is to point out the diſtinction between Jeſus *the bridegroom* and John *his friend,* the arrangement I have given the words is more ſuited to the Eng. idiom. The other way appears to us as an inverſion of the natural order, and is conſequently leſs perſpicuous.

32. *Yet his teſtimony is not received.* This, compared with the clauſe, *He who receiveth his teſtimony,* which immediately follows, is a ſtrong evidence that the words of Scripture ought not to be more rigidly interpreted, than the ordinary ſtyle of dialogue; where-

in ſuch hyperboles as *all* for *many*, and *none* for *few*, are quite familiar.

33. *Voucheth the veracity of God*, ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστιν. E. T. *Hath ſet to his ſeal that God is true.* As *ſealing* was employed for vouching the authenticity of writs, *to ſeal* came, by a natural and eaſy tranſition, to ſignify *to vouch, to atteſt.* Our acceptance of God's meſſage by his Son, through an unſhaken faith, vouches, on our part, the faithfulneſs of God, and the truth of his promiſes.

CHAP. IV.

1. *Jeſus*, ὁ κυριος. E. T. *The Lord.* But the Cam. and ten other MSS. read ὁ ἰησους. It is thus read alſo in the Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. the Arm. the Ara. and the Sax. verſions. Chr. has read ſo, and it is alſo in ſome printed editions. As this difference in reading makes not the ſmalleſt change in the ſenſe, but a change to the better in the compoſition of the ſentence, I thought the above mentioned authority ſufficient for adopting it. The way in which the ſentence runs in the E. T. would naturally lead the reader to think that one perſon is meant by *the Lord*, and another by *Jeſus*. *When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Phariſees had heard that Jeſus made*——Several of the authorities aforeſaid drop ιησους in the laſter part of the verſe. I am ſurpriſed that this has been overlooked by Wet.

5. *Near the heritage*, πλησιον του χωριου. E. T. *Near to the parcel of ground.* This application of the word *parcel* is very unuſual. The word χωριον means an eſtate in land; and as the eſtate here ſpoken of was given by the Patriarch to his ſon Joſeph, to be poſſeſſed by him and his poſterity, it is properly denominated *heritage*, agreeably to what we are told, Joſh. xxi. 32. It is ſo rendered into Fr. by Beau. Sa. P. R. and Si.

9. *For the Jews have no friendly intercourſe with the Samaritans*, ου γαρ συγχρωνται ιουδαιοι Σαμαρειταις. E. T. *For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.* That the word *dealings* implies too much to ſuit the ſenſe of this paſſage, is manifeſt from the preceding verſe, where we are told that the diſciples were gone into the Samaritan city Sychar to buy food. The verb συγχραομαι is one of thoſe called απαξ λεγομενα; it does not occur in any other place of the N. T. or in the Sep. The Phariſees were in their traditions nice diſtinguishers. Buying and ſelling with Samaritans was permitted, becauſe that was conſidered as an intercourſe merely of intereſt or convenience; borrowing and lending, much more aſking or accepting any favour, was prohibited; becauſe that was regarded as an intercourſe of friendſhip, which they thought impious to maintain with thoſe whom they looked upon as the enemies of God.

10. *The bounty of God*, την δωρεαν του Θεου E. T. *The gift of God.* The word δωρεα means not only a particular gift, but that diſpoſition of mind from which the gift ariſes, *bounty, liberality, goodneſs.* In this ſenſe it is ſometimes uſed by the Apoſtle Paul, as Eph. iii. 7. iv. 7. Moſt tranſlators, not attending to this, have rendered theſe verſes by tautologies and indefinite expreſſions, to the great hurt of perſpicuity. The meaning of the word is, I imagine, the ſame in Heb. vi. 4. But the plaineſt example of this acceptation we have in the Apocryphal book of Wiſdom, ch. xvi. 25, where the care of Providence in ſupporting every living thing is, in an addreſs to God, called ὁ παντοτροφος σου δωρεα, literally in Eng. *thy all nouriſhing bounty.* This meaning appears alſo more pertinent and emphatical in the paſſage under conſideration. A particular gift cannot be underſtood as referred to, when there is nothing in the context to ſuggeſt it. But there ſeems to be intended here a contraſt between the munificence of God, which extends to thoſe of all regions and denominations upon the earth, and the contracted ſpirit of man, who is ingenious in deviſing pretexts for confining the divine liberality to as few objects as poſſible. To this train of ſentiment the preceding words naturally lead. The woman had expreſſed her aſtoniſhment that a Jew could aſk even ſo ſmall a favour as a draught of water from a Samaritan. Jeſus tells her, that if ſhe had conſidered more the bounty of the univerſal Parent, from which none are excluded by the diſtinction of Jew, Samaritan, or Heathen, than maxims founded in the malignity of man, and if ſhe had known the character of him who talked with her, ſhe might have aſked ſucceſsfuly a gift infinitely more important.

10. *Living water*, ὑδωρ ζων. It may ſurpriſe an Engliſh reader, unacquainted with the Oriental idiom, that this woman, who appears by the ſequel to have totally miſunderſtood our Lord, did not aſk what he meant by *living water*, but proceeded on the ſuppoſition that ſhe underſtood him perfectly, and only did not conceive how, without ſome veſſel for drawing and containing that water, he could provide her with it to drink. The truth is, the expreſſion is ambiguous. In the moſt familiar acceptation, *living water* meant no more than running water. In this ſenſe the water of ſprings and rivers would be denominated *living*, as that of ciſterns and lakes would be called *dead*, becauſe motionleſs. Thus, Gen. xxvi. 19. we are told that Iſaac's ſervants digged in the valley, and found there a well of ſpringing water. It is *living water* both in the Heb. and in the Gr. as marked on the margin of our Bibles. Thus alſo, Lev. xiv. 5. what is rendered *running water* in the Eng. Bible, is in both thoſe languages *living water*. Nay, this uſe was not unknown to the Latins, as may be proved from Virgil and Ovid. In this paſſage, however, our Lord uſes the expreſſion in the more ſublime ſenſe for divine teaching, but was miſtaken by the woman as uſing it in the popular acceptation.

11. *Thou haſt no bucket*, ουτε αντλημα εχεις. E. T. *Thou haſt nothing to draw with.* Αντλημα, from αντλεω, *haurio*, is *hauſtrum, ſtitula, vas ad hauriendum*; which is the definition of a *bucket*. So Dod. alſo renders the word.

20. *This mountain*, to wit, Gerizim, at the foot of which Sychar was built, and on which the Samaritans had formerly erected a temple, though not then remaining. For they pretended that this was the place where the Patriarchs had offered ſacrifice, and which God himſelf had ſet apart as the only place conſecrated for the performance of the moſt ſolemn and public ceremonies of their religion. In ſupport of this their opinion, they quote ſome paſſages from the Pentateuch (the only part of Scripture which they acknowledge), particularly Deut. xxvii. 4. where, inſtead of Ebal, as it is in all the Jewiſh copies of the Heb. Scriptures commonly received, the Samaritan copies of the ſame Scriptures read Gerizim.

22. *Ye worſhip what ye know not; we worſhip what we know*—υμεις προσκυνειτε ο ουκ οιδατε· ημεις προσκυνουμεν ο οιδαμεν. E. T. *Ye worſhip ye know not what; we know what we worſhip.* There is apparently no difference between theſe two verſions, except that the firſt keeps cloſer to the arrangement of the Gr. But in effect this makes here a conſiderable difference. The ſame thought is conveyed in both; but in the former with the ſimplicity of the original, wherein in great plainneſs is uſed, but nothing that ſavours of paſſion; whereas it is impoſſible to read the latter without perceiving much of the manner of a contemptuous reproach, and what would have therefore more befitted the mouth of a Phariſee than of our Lord. So much in language depends often on a very ſmall circumſtance. *What ye know not*, contraſted to *what we know*, implies, in the Heb. idiom, not total ignorance, but inferior knowledge. Thus *love* and *hatred* are oppoſed (See L. xiv. 26.), to denote merely greater and leſs love. Now, if the writings of the Prophets were of importance for conveying the knowledge of the perfections and will of God, the Samaritans, who rejected all thoſe writings (receiving only for canonical the five books of Moſes), muſt, on this head, have been more ignorant than the Jews, which is all that our Saviour's words imply.

22. *Salvation is from the Jews.*—The Saviour or the Meſſiah muſt be of that nation, of the tribe of Judah, and poſterity of David.

25. *I know that the Meſſiah cometh; (that is, the Chriſt.).* Οιδα οτι Μεσσιας ερχεται, ο λεγομενος Χριστος. E. T. *I know that Meſſias cometh, which is called Chriſt.* In the manner wherein the laſt clauſe, *which is called Chriſt*, is here expreſſed, it appears to have been ſpoken by the woman: yet it is manifeſt that that could not have been the caſe. Our Lord and the woman ſpoke a dialect of the Chaldee, at that time the language of the country, and in the N. T. called Hebrew, wherein *Meſſiah* was the proper term, and conſequently needed not to be explained to either into Greek, which they were not ſpeaking, and which was a foreign language to both. But it was very proper for the Evangeliſt, who wrote in Greek, and in the midſt of thoſe who did not underſtand Chaldee, when introducing an Oriental term, to explain it for the ſake of his Gr. readers. Ch. i. 43. N.

27. *That he talked with a woman*, οτι μετα γυναικος ελαλει. E. T. *That he talked with the woman.* The learned reader will obſerve, that γυναικος here has no article, and is conſequently better rendered *a woman*. We need not be ſurpriſed that it ſhould be matter of wonder to the diſciples, that their Maſter was talking with a *woman*; for ſo great at that time was the pride of the learned in that nation, that they imagined that to have a dialogue with ſuch, on any ſerious and important matter, did but ill ſuit the dignity and gravity which ought to be uniformly maintained by a rabbi or doctor of their law. Admit that the paſſages in proof of this, produced by Lightfoot, from the Talmud and rabbinical writers, are unaccountable and ſtupid, as Dod. angrily calls them, they are ſufficient evidence that ſuch a ſentiment, however unaccountable and ſtupid, prevailed among them. Now it is the fact, the prevalence of the ſentiment, and not its reaſonableneſs, with which the interpreter is concerned. Further, that the diſciples were not, in any thing, ſuperior to the prejudices of the age, is manifeſt from the whole of their hiſtory. That the woman was a Samaritan, doubtleſs, made the thing more aſtoniſhing.

29. *Is this the Meſſiah?* μητι ουτος εστιν ο Χριστος; ſee Mt. xii. 23. N. Add to the examples produced there, for ſhowing the import of μητι, the following from this Goſpel, ch. vii. 31. viii. 22. xviii. 35. xxi. 5. The reaſon given by Knatchbull for preferring the common verſion is far from being deciſive. Though the woman's opinion had been (as probably it was) that our Lord was the Meſſiah; ſtill it was more becoming in her to put the queſtion ſimply to the men of the city, *Is this the Meſſiah?* than in the other way, *Is not this the Meſſiah?* which plainly ſuggeſted her own opinion, before ſhe heard theirs. The internal evidence, ariſing from the ſcope of the paſſage, is therefore, to ſay the leaſt, as favourable to this interpretation as to the other; and the external evidence ariſing from uſe, which in this caſe ought to preponderate, is entirely in its favour.

42. *The Meſſiah*, ο Χριστος. This is wanting in two or three MSS. and in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Ethiop. and Sax. verſions.

44. [*But not to Nazareth*]. There is a probability that ſomething to this purpoſe has been very early omitted in tranſcribing. The cauſal conjunction γαρ, which introduces the verſe, ſhows that it contains the reaſon

reaſon of what had immediately preceded. As, however, in regard to the clauſe itſelf, we have nothing more than conjecture from the ſcope of the place, and the known hiſtorical facts, I have incloſed in crotchets, the words which I thought it neceſſary to ſupply. —By his *country*, πατρις, is commonly meant *Nazareth*, ſuppoſed to be his native city, and in fact the place of his early reſidence.

46. *Officer of the court*, βασιλικος. E. T. *Nobleman.* The Sy. and Ara. render it a *ſervant* or *miniſter of the king*; that is, of Herod the tetrarch of Galilee, commonly in that country (whoſe language did not ſupply words correſponding to all the diſtinctions made by the Greeks) ſtyled *king*. The Vul. ſays *regulus*; but, in the judgment of the beſt critics, the word then implied no more than *regius*, and denoted in general an eminent officer of the court. The Eng. word *nobleman* conveys the notion of hereditary rank and certain dignities, to which there was nothing in Paleſtine, or even in Syria, that correſponded. Yet all the late Eng. verſions have in this implicitly followed the common tranſlation; and it is remarkable, that not one of the foreign verſions I have ſeen, has adopted a term anſwering to that Eng. word. Diſſ. VII. P. I. § 5, 6.

54. *This ſecond miracle Jeſus performed after returning from Judea, to Galilee*, τουτο παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ὁ Ιησους, ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν. E. T. *This is again the ſecond miracle that Jeſus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee.* The words of the hiſtorian do not neceſſarily imply more than that this, which was the ſecond of our Lord's miracles in that country, was performed after returning from Judea to Galilee; the firſt miracle being underſtood to be that of turning water into wine at the marriage in Cana. From the way in which it is expreſſed in the common verſion, we ſhould conclude that both miracles were after the return to Galilee, which is not agreeable to the fact as related in the preceding part of this hiſtory. The word παλιν, whatever be the interpretation, muſt be placed differently. I arrange the words in this manner: Τουτο δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ὁ Ιησους, παλιν ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν. It is agreeable to a rule of univerſal grammar, that, in conſtruing a ſentence, the adverbs be joined to the verbs or the participles. There are here but two of theſe, εποιησεν and ελθων. To join παλιν to the former would be abſurd, becauſe it would repreſent the ſame individual miracle as twice performed. It muſt, by conſequence, be joined to the latter.

CHAP. V.

2. *There is*, εστι. The Sy. ſeems to have read ην, as it is rendered in that verſion in the paſt. Cyril, Chr. and The. favour this reading, ſo does Nonnus. If tolerably ſupported, it would be accounted preferable, as this Goſpel was written after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

2. *Nigh the ſheep gate*, επι τη προβατικη. E. T. *By the ſheep-market.* This clauſe is omitted in the Sy. and Sax. verſions. The learned reader will obſerve that there is nothing in the Gr. which anſwers to either *gate* or *market*; but the word uſed, being an adjective, requires ſome ſuch addition to complete the ſenſe. Now we have good evidence, that one of the gates of Jeruſalem was called *the ſheep-gate.* See Nehem. iii. 1. & 32. xii. 39. But we have no evidence that any place there was called *the ſheep-market.* Be. renders the words *ad portam pecuariam*; Dio. *preſſo della porta delle pecore*: P. R. Beau. L. Cl. *près de la porte de brebis*; in Eng. the An. Hey. and Weſ. *by the ſheep-gate.* The Vul. ſeems to have read differently. The prepoſition επι is omitted, and the words προβατικη κολυμβηθρα are read as adjective and ſubſtantive, in the nominative caſe, *eſt autem probatica piſcina quæ cognominatur Hebraice Bethſaida.* With this Caſ. partly agrees and partly differs. He reads the prepoſition as in the Gr. and προβατικη κολυμβηθρα, as agreeing in the dative, *eſt autem Hieroſolymis apud ovariacam piſcinam ea quæ Hebraice Bethesda nuncupatur.* The reading in the Vul. is quite unſupported, and therefore not worthy of regard. Caſ. aſſigns two reaſons for his interpretation. One is, that προβατικη would be without a ſubſtantive. Now it is a known idiom in Gr. to employ an adjective alone, when the ſubſtantive to be ſupplied is eaſily ſuggeſted either by the import of the adjective, or by frequent uſe. Thus the names of moſt arts and ſciences in Gr. are the feminines of adjectives, whoſe meaning eaſily ſuggeſts the word underſtood. Μυστικη, for inſtance, ιατρικη, μαθηματικη, τεχνη being underſtood to each of the two former, and επιστημη to the laſt. The frequent conjunction of a particular ſubſtantive with a particular adjective, produces the ſame effect. Now, if one of the gates of Jeruſalem was ever called ἡ προβατικη πυλη, as we know from the O. T. that it was, nothing could be more natural in thoſe who ſpoke Gr. than to drop πυλη as ſuperfluous, and name it ſimply ἡ προβατικη. This would happen ſtill more readily, if the adjective was in a manner appropriated to that ſingle uſe. Now it is remarkable, that the adjective προβατικος occurs nowhere in the N. T. but in this paſſage; and never in the Old, but where mention is made of *the ſheep-gate* of Jeruſalem. Ἡμερα κυριακη occurs once in N. T. and is properly rendered *the Lord's day* (Rev. i. 10.). The frequent appropriation of this diſtinction to the firſt day of the week, and the cuſtom ariſing thence, of conceiving ἡμερα as cloſely connected with κυριακη, brought people gradually to drop ἡμερα as unneceſſary, being what the hearer's knowledge and habits would readily ſupply. In this manner κυριακη alone in Gr. and *dominica* in Lat. came to ſignify *the Lord's day.* Βασιλικος, in the former chapter, which ſignifies *an officer of the court*, is properly an adjective in the maſculine, anſwering to *regius* in Lat. and *royal* in Eng. To make the expreſſion complete, we muſt ſupply ανθρωπος. In like manner

βασιλειον

βασιλειον (L. vii. 25.), the neuter gender of βασιλειος, an adjective of the ſame ſignification, has come to denote *a royal palace*. The word οικητηριον, or ſome other neuter of the ſame import, has been joined with it at firſt, but afterwards overlooked as uſeleſs. Take the following examples for a ſpecimen from the Goſpels, Mt. vi. 3. η αριστερα, ſcilicet χειρ, *the left hand*, x. 42. ποτηριον ψυχρου, ſcilicet ὑδατος, *a cup of cold water*. L. i. 39. εις την ορεινην, ſcilicet χωραν, into *the hill country*. J. xx. 12. εν λευκοις, ſcilicet ἱματιοις, *in white garments*. Caſtalio's other objection againſt the common rendering is, that it appropriates the name *Betheſda*, which ſignifies *the houſe of mercy*, improperly to *a pool* or bath, which cannot in any ſenſe be denominated *a houſe*. I anſwer firſt, that though *Beth*, the firſt part of the name *Betheſda*, denotes commonly *a houſe*; yet when ſuch terms are compounded with others in forming a proper name, they ought not to be ſo ſtrictly interpreted. The place to which Jacob firſt gave the name *Bethel*, that is, *the houſe of God*, Gen. xxviii. 10, &c. was evidently at the time a place in the open fields, where he had ſlept all night, with a ſtone for his pillow, and had the dream of the ladder. That there was then in the vicinity, or afterwards perhaps upon the ſpot, a city which was firſt called *Luz*, and probably after the diviſion of the country by Joſhua, *Bethel*, in memory of what had there happened to the Patriarch, is readily admitted. When *Beth* made part of the name of a city, there was a plain deviation from the primitive meaning of the word. Yet nothing was more common. *Bethlehem*, the city of David, denotes *the houſe of bread*. What was called by the Greeks *Heliopolis*, the city of the ſun, was in Heb. *Bethſhemiſh*, the houſe of the ſun. I anſwer, 2dly, That we ought not to confine the ſignification of κολυμβηθρα to the water collected, but ought to conſider it as including the covered walks, and all that had been built for the accommodation of thoſe who came thither. In this extent the word *bath* is familiarly uſed by ourſelves. I have preferred the name *bath* to *pool*, as more ſuitable to the purpoſe to which this water was appropriated.

4. *A meſſenger*, αγγελος. Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 12.

16. *And ſought to kill him*, και εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι. This clauſe is not in the Cam. and ſome other MSS. of note. It is wanting alſo in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. verſions.

18. *By calling God peculiarly his Father, had equalled himſelf with God*, πατερα ἱδιον ελεγε του Θεον, ἱσον ἑαυτον ποιων τω Θεω. E. T. *Said alſo that god was his Father, making himſelf equal with God.* On a little reflection it muſt be evident that the ſenſe is here imperfectly expreſſed. For how could thoſe men ſay that Jeſus, by calling God his father, made himſelf equal with God, when they made no ſcruple themſelves to call God their father (ch. viii. 41.), and yet would have thought it very injurious in any man to infer that they made themſelves equal with God? There muſt, therefore, be here ſomething peculiar and energetic in the word ἱδιος. The expreſſion in moſt familiar uſe would have been πατερα ἑαυτου. And, though I am far from ſaying that there are not many caſes in which either expreſſion may be uſed indifferently, there are ſome in which ἱδιος is more emphatical, and others in which it would not be ſtrictly proper. Be.'s explanation of the word is very juſt; *ſuum, ἱδιον, id eſt ſibi proprium ac peculiarem*. In this view the import of the words is, that God is father to him in a ſenſe wherein he is father to no other. Let it be obſerved, however, that if the ſcope of the context did not neceſſarily lead to this concluſion, I ſhould not infer ſo much from the mere application of the word ἱδιος: for though this is ſtrictly the import of the term, it is often, like many other words, employed with greater latitude. Perhaps, on a ſuperficial view, I ſhall be thought in this to concur with a writer who, in ſupport of a favourite hypotheſis, has thus explained the precept (1 Cor. vii. 2.), ἑκαστη τον ἱδιον ανδρα εχετω, "Let every married woman "have the man appropiated to her excluſively of all "other men upon earth." If, inſtead of men, he had ſaid women, he would have hit the ſenſe entirely, and ſuited the explanation here given of the word. As it ſtands, there is an indiſtinctneſs in the expreſſion, which ſerves only to darken it. The excluſion of other men in this explanation, muſt ſatisfy every one that the words *the man appropriated to her*, are uſed, by what figure I know not, for *the man to whom ſhe is appropriated*. This ſtrange confuſion in the uſe of words, is frequent with that writer. Thus, a little after, "The word ἱδιος," he ſays, "ſeems to denote "ſuch an appropriation of the huſband to the wife;" (who would not expect it to follow, *as that he could not have, or go to any other woman?* but hear himſelf,) "as that ſhe could not have, or go to any other "man." Now this ſhows merely the appropriation of the wife to the huſband, but by no means the appropriation of the huſband to the wife. ἱδιος is, by this account, made ſynonymous with μονος, ſo that ἱδιος ανηρ means her only huſband. By the ſame rule, in the parable of the compaſſionate Samaritan, who is ſaid (L. x. 34.) to have ſet the wounded Jew επι το ἱδιον κτηνος, we ought to render theſe words, not *on his own beaſt*, but *on his only beaſt*: or, to define it in this critic's own terms, the beaſt appropriated to him excluſively of all other beaſts upon earth. And to give one other inſtance; where we have in the E. T. (L. vi. 41.), *but perceiveſt not the beam that is in thine own eye*, the words εν τω ἱδιω οφθαλμω ought to be rendered *in thine only eye*. Let it be obſerved, that the term ἱδιος is always conceived as denoting the perſon or thing appropriated, not the proprietary. In this view ἱδιος is oppoſed to κοινος; ſo that in ſtrictneſs I have no title to call any thing ἱδιον which I enjoy in common with others; that this is agreeable to ſcriptural uſage, we learn from Acts, iv. 32. ουδε εις τι των ὑπαρχοντων αυτω ελεγεν ἱδιον εἱναι, αλλ' ην αυτοις απαντα κοινα.

κοινα. *Neither ſaid any of them, that ought of the things which he poſſeſſed was his own; but they had all things common.* If ſo, no woman can call any man ιδιος ανηρ, her own, whom ſhe has for a huſband in common with other women: for ſuch a man, in regard to his wives, is αυτοις πασαις κοινος, and conſequently μαθηματα αυτων ιδιος. To apply this to the controverted paſſage: the ſenſe may be juſtly expreſſed by the periphraſis quoted from Be. *unaquæque habeat virum ſibi proprium ac peculiarem;* in Eng. *Let every woman have the huſband appropriated and peculiar to herſelf.* If the caſe had been reverſed, and the Apoſtle had ſaid εκαστος την ιδιαν γυναικα εχετω και εκαστη του ιδιου ανδρα, it might have been pleaded with ſome plauſibility, that the woman was repreſented as the man's property, who has an excluſive right to her, whereas the man was mentioned merely as her huſband. For my part I acknowledge that, in ſuch general precepts, the two phraſes are commonly equivalent, that the marriage bond is reciprocal, and that if there has been here an intentional difference in applying thoſe expreſſions, the Apoſtle muſt have judged it neceſſary, from the circumſtances of the times, to ſignify, in a more explicit manner, the appropriation of the huſband to the wife, than that of the wife to the huſband. From the corrupt cuſtoms that then prevailed among both Jews and Pagans, there muſt have been greater need to inculcate on Chriſtian huſbands than on Chriſtian wives, that the marriage bond confined each of them to one, and that if the men challenged a property in their wives, it could be in no other ſenſe admitted than in that wherein their wives were entitled to challange a property in them. That author, therefore, has been exceedingly unlucky in urging the emphatical import of ιδιος in the precept above mentioned: for it is manifeſt that the emphaſis, if allowed, muſt ſubvert his whole theory. His only reſource, therefore, is that of thoſe who, though they have overlooked this blunder in his reaſoning, have ſo learnedly criticiſed his work, and who affirm, with truth, that ſuch expreſſions are often uſed indiſcriminately. In this way he may obtain a neutrality from a quarter otherwiſe hoſtile. That author thinks it remarkable, and, I own, I think ſo too, that it is always in the N. T. ιδιος ανηρ, and never ιδια γυνη; nor can I give any account of a uſe ſo much in favour of the weaker ſex, but what has been already ſuggeſted. There was no danger that any woman ſhould think herſelf entitled to a plurality of huſbands, a thing repugnant to the laws and cuſtoms of all nations; but there was great danger, that there might be men who would claim a plurality of wives. This is the more worthy of notice in the writers of the N. T. as no ſuch expreſſion occurs ſo much as once in the verſion of the O. T. by the Seventy. It is there invariably ανηρ αυτης or εαυτης, never ιδιος ανηρ: for, during that diſpenſation, it muſt be owned, things ſtood on a different footing. Nor could the obligations which married perſons were by poſitive law brought under, be ſaid to have been perfectly reciprocal; for the wife could not then claim the ſame excluſive property in her huſband as at preſent. But, to return from what may be thought a digreſſion: though of conſequence for aſcertaining the import of the term, I have not rendered πατηρ ιδιον, with moſt moderns, *his own father*, becauſe the word *own* adds nothing to the import of the poſſeſſive *his*; it ſerves only to fix the attention on this circumſtance. The adverb *peculiarly* ſeems much better adapted here to ſupply the defect.

20. *Which will aſtoniſh you,* ινα υμεις θαυμαζητε, Mt. i. 22. 2. N.

22. *Having committed the power of judging entirely to the Son,* αλλα την κρισιν πασαν δεδωκε τω υιω. E. T. *But hath committed all judgment unto the Son.* There are two Gr. words, κρισις and κριμα, which are commonly rendered *judgment*. They are not ſynonymous, though ſometimes uſed indiſcriminately. Κρισις expreſſes more properly the power and even act of judging, *judicatio*; κριμα the effect, *judicium*, the ſentence pronounced, or even the puniſhment inflicted. Our Eng. word *judgment* is too indefinite to convey diſtinctly our Lord's meaning in this place. It is the verſion rather of κριμα than of κρισις. The Fr. tranſlators, L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Sa. Si. render πασαν κρισιν, *tout pouvoir de juger.*

27. *Becauſe he is a ſon of man,* οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστιν. E. T. *Becauſe he is the ſon of man.* It is obſerved by Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures), that it is not here ο υιος του ανθρωπου, the humble appellation by which our Lord commonly diſtinguiſhed himſelf, but ſimply υιος ανθρωπου, without any article, a common Hebraiſm, and ſtill more common Syriaſm, for *a man*, a human being. This phraſe occurs in the ſame ſenſe, Dan. vii. 13. and Rev. i. 13. and ought to be ſo rendered; but it occurs nowhere in the Goſpels, except in this paſſage. None of the Eng. tranſlations I have ſeen mark this diſtinction; but it has been attended to by ſome foreign tranſlators. Dio. *Inquanto egli è figliuol d'huomo.* G. F. *Entant qu'il eſt fils de l'homme.* L. Cl. P. R. and Sa. ſay alſo, *fils de l'homme*, without the article. Diſſ. V. P. IV. § 13. It will, perhaps, be aſked, But what is the meaning of the clauſe here, *becauſe he is a ſon of man?* In my judgment, the import may be expreſſed in this manner—'becauſe it ſuits the 'ends of divine wiſdom, that the Judge, as well as 'Saviour, of men ſhould himſelf be man.'

31. *My teſtimony is not to be regarded,* η μαρτυρια μου ουκ εστιν αληθης. E. T. *My witneſs is not true.* In every country where there are ſtanding laws, and a regular conſtitution, there is what is called a forenſic or juridical uſe of certain words, which differs conſiderably from familiar uſe. I obſerved ſomething of this kind in regard to δικαιος (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.), which, in the ſtyle of the law, means no more than, *not guilty of the crime charged.* The like holds of the word αληθης,

which, when used in reference to the procedure in judicatories, denotes, not what is in itself true, but what is *proved*, or what is accounted legal proof. Thus, it is said, that a man's testimony of himself is not true. A man may certainly give a true testimony of himself; but in law it is not *evidence*, and is therefore held as *untrue*. This sense of the word αληθης often occurs in this Gospel. Now, as such peculiarities, in any tongue, have an awkward appearance when translated into another, I have thought it more eligible to convey the sense with as little of circumlocution as possible. Hey. and Wes. fix *valid*; but this term does not give the exact meaning.

35. *He was the lighted and shining lamp*, εκεινος ην ο λυχνος ο καιομενος και φαινων. E. T. *He was a burning and a shining light.* Not only our translators, but the much greater number of modern translators, have entirely overlooked the article in this place. Yet the structure of the sentence, and the repetition of the article before the participle καιομενος, serve to draw our attention to it. It ought to be remembered, that John's ministry was of a peculiar character: that he was the single Prophet in whom the old dispensation had its completion and by whom the new was introduced; that, therefore, until our Lord's ministry took place, John may justly be said to have been *the light* of that generation. Perhaps there is an allusion here to the expression in the Psalms, cxxxii. (or, as it is in the Gr. cxxxi.) 17. ητοιμασα τω χριστω μου λυχνον, and consequently an insinuation that this was *the lamp* which God had provided according to his promise. The only modern interpreters I know, who have added the article here, are Dio. in Itn. and Si. in Fr.

36. *Light.d*, καιομενον. E. T. *Burning.* The verb καιειν signifies *to light, to kindle, to burn.* When it is construed with λυχνος, λαμπας, or any other such term, it is properly *to light*, and is, or may be, always so rendered. See Mt. v. 15. L. xii. 35. But some are of opinion, that the word *burning*, as coupled here with *shining*, is much more expressive; inasmuch as it superadds to knowledge an ardour, zeal, or good affection in the service of God; and are convinced, that the one epithet alludes to the attractive influence of John's example, and the other to the perspicuity of his instructions. To this most paraphrasts, as Clerke and Dod. seem to have attended. But I am not satisfied that, in the original, there is any allusion of this kind. A lamp is used, not for warming people, but for giving them light. To me, in the word καιομενον, there appears rather a suggestion of the divine illumination of the Baptist. The light which was kept always burning in the sanctuary, and which came originally from heaven, was, in the judgment of the rabbies, an emblem of the light of prophecy. To many of our Lord's hearers, therefore, the word καιομενον would not appear an insignificant epithet, but an apposite suggestion of the source whence John derived his doctrine.

37, 38. *Did ye never hear his voice, or see his form? Or have ye forgotten his declaration, that ye believe not him whom he hath commissioned?* ουτε φωνην αυτου ακηκοατε πωποτε, ουτε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε. Και τον λογον αυτου ουκ εχετε μενοντα εν υμιν· οτι ον απεστειλεν εκεινος, τουτω υμεις ου πιστευετε. E. T. *Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.* The reader will observe, that the two clauses which are rendered in the E. T. as declarations, are in this version translated as questions. The difference in the original is only in the pointing. That they ought to be so read, we need not, in my opinion, stronger evidence than that they throw much light upon the whole passage, which, read in the common way, is both dark and ill connected. See an excellent note on this passage from Mr. Turner of Wakefield (Priestley's Harmony, sect xl.). Our Lord here refers them to the testimony given of him at his baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended on him in a visible form, and when God, with an audible voice, declared him to be his beloved son and our law-giver, whom we ought to hear and obey. What has chiefly contributed to mislead interpreters, in regard to the import of this sentence, is the resemblance which it bears to what is said, ch. i. 18. Θεον ουδεις εωρακε πωποτε, *no one ever saw God*; and, ch. vi. 46. ουχ' οτι τον πατερα τις εωρακε, *not that any one hath seen the Father.* There is, however, a difference in the expressions; for it is not said here, ουτε τον πατερα, but ουτε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε. This, it may be thought, as it seems to ascribe a body to God, must be understood in the same way; for we are told, Deut. iv. 12. that, when the Lord spake to the people out of the fire, they saw no *similitude*. Of this they are again reminded, verse 15. But the word in the Sep. is, in both places, not ειδος, but ομοιωμα, which, in scriptural use, appears to denote a figure so distinct and permanent, as that it may be represented in stone, wood, or metal. Now, though this is not to be attributed to God, the sacred writers do not scruple to call the visible symbol which God, on any occasion, employs for impressing men more strongly with a sense of his presence, ειδος αυτου, which (for want of a better term) I have rendered *his form.* Thus the Evangelist L. says, ch. iii. 22. in relating that signal transaction which is here alluded to, that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus, σωματικω ειδει, *in a bodily form.* Thus, also, the word ειδος is applied to the appearances which God made to men, under the Mosaic dispensation. His appearance in fire upon Mount Sinai, is called by the Seventy, Ex. xxiv. 17. το ειδος της δοξης κυριου; in our Bible, *the sight of the glory of the Lord*; more properly, *the glorious form* or *appearance of the Lord.* In like manner, the word ειδος is applied to the symbol of the divine presence, which the Israelites enjoyed in the wilderness, the *cloud* which covered the tabernacle in the day-time, and appeared as *fire* in the night, Num. ix. 15, 16. And, to mention but one other instance, the display which he made to Moses, when he conversed with him face to face,

is,

is, in the E. T. ſaid to be *apparently*, Num. xii. 8.; but in the Sept. ου δι' ειδους, that is, *in a form* or *viſible figure*. Thus, in the language of Scripture, there is a manifeſt difference between *ſeing God*, which no man ever did, he being in himſelf a pure ſpirit, and ſeeing *his form*, το ειδος αυτου, the appearance which, at any time, in condeſcenſion to the weakneſs of his creatures, he pleaſes to aſſume. Another evidence, if neceſſary, might be brought to ſhow that there was no intention here to expreſs the inviſibility of the divine nature; and is as follows: the clauſe which appears to have been ſo much miſunderſtood, is coupled with this other, ουτε φωνην αυτου ακηκοατε πωποτε. Can we imagine that the impoſſible would have been thus conjoined with what is commonly mentioned as a privilege often enjoyed by God's people, and to which their attention is required as a duty? For though we are expreſsly told, that *no man ever ſaw God*, it is nowhere ſaid that no man ever heard his voice. Nay, in the very place above quoted, Deut. iv. 12. where we are informed that the people ſaw no *ſimilitude*, ομοιωμα, it is particularly mentioned, that they heard *the voice*. To conclude: there is the greater probability in the explanation which I have given of the words, as all the chief circumſtances attending that memorable teſtimony at his baptiſm are exactly pointed out,—the miraculous voice from heaven, the deſcent of the Holy Spirit in a bodily form, and the declaration itſelf then given. Dr. Clarke ſeems to have had ſome apprehenſion of this meaning; for though, in his paraphraſe, he explains the words in the uſual way, he, in a parentheſis, takes notice of the two ſtriking circumſtances, the voice and the form at our Lord's baptiſm. That what is called *his word*, or declaration, verſe 38th, refers to the ſame thing, is evident: for, otherwiſe, it would coincide with the teſtimony of Scripture, which is not introduced till verſe 39th.

39. *Ye ſearch the Scriptures*, ερευνατε τας γραφας. E. T. *Search the Scriptures*. The words of the Evangeliſt may be interpreted either way, or even as an interrogation—*Do ye ſearch?* The tranſlator's only rule, in ſuch caſes, is the connection. To me it is evident, that nothing ſuits this ſo well as the indicative. All agree, that κ θελετε ελθειν, which is coupled to the former verb by the conjunction και, is an indicative. Yet this is hardly conſiſtent with propriety, if ερευνατε be not. Beſides, the whole reaſoning is rendered weaker by the vulgar interpretation. It is entirely ſuitable to ſay, *Ye ſearch, becauſe ye think thereby to obtain*—Ye act thus, in conformity to a fixed opinion. But if the words be underſtood as a command, it is not a cogent argument. Search, becauſe ye think, for men may be miſtaken in their thoughts; but ſearch, becauſe ye can thereby obtain. In Sy. and La. the words have the ſame ambiguity as in Gr. In Fr. L. Cl. Beau. and P. R. render it, as here, by the indicative; and in Eng. the An. Dod. Hey. and Wor. It has been ſaid, that the ſecond perſon plural of the preſent of the indicative, beginning a ſentence, and not preceded by the pronoun, is to be underſtood as a queſtion. If it be not a queſtion, the verb muſt be read imperatively. In contradiction to this, many clear examples from Scripture, have been produced by former expoſitors.

CHAP. VI.

11. *To thoſe who had lain down*, τοις μαθηταις· οι δε μαθηται τοις ανακειμενοις. E. T. *To the diſciples, and the diſciples to them that were ſet down*. The words τοις μαθηταις· οι δε μαθηται, are wanting in a few MSS. of which the Al. is one. There is nothing anſwering to them in any of the following verſions: the Vul. the two Sy. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. and Ara. Nonnos omits them; ſo does Origen. I confeſs, that the principal reaſon for rejecting this clauſe, is the almoſt unanimous teſtimony of ancient verſions againſt it. Several interpolations of little conſequence have ariſen from the indiſcreet zeal of tranſcribers, in ſupplying what they thought deficient in one Goſpel out of another. Of this, the preſent clauſe, taken from Mt. xiv. 19. appears to be an example.

26. In this and the two following verſes, is contained a ſentence more involved than any other in this Goſpel. Indeed, it is ſo unlike the compoſition of this Evangeliſt, as to give ground to ſuſpect that it has been injured in tranſcribing. This writer often, indeed, uſes tautologies; but, except in this paſſage, they occaſion no darkneſs or perplexity. The clauſe, εκεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται αυτου—E. T. *that wherein his diſciples were entered*—is not in the Al. nor in ſome other MSS. There is no correſponding clauſe in the Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Eth. and Ara. verſions; nor in Nonnus. Ben. and Mill reject it. The Sy. has read the clauſe, but avoided the tautology, by omitting the following clauſe in this verſe, to the ſame purpoſe —αλλα μονοι οι μαθηται αυτου απηλθον. I have adopted the reading of the Vul. as preferable upon the whole.

27. *For to him the Father, that is, God, hath given his atteſtation*, τουτον γαρ ο πατηρ εσφραγισεν, ο Θεος, E. T. *For him hath God the Father ſealed*. By the manner in which ο Θεος, *God*, is introduced in the end of the ſentence, it is manifeſtly done in explanation of ο πατηρ; accordingly, the ſentence is complete before that word is added. It was the more pertinent here to add it, as our Lord, in the preceding part of the ſentence, is called *the Son of Man*. It might, therefore, be ſuppoſed, that, by the Father, who vouched him, is meant ſome human being. The addition, ο Θεος, *that is, God*, entirely precludes this miſtake. *The Father* was a title from the earlieſt ages given to the Deity, to diſtinguiſh him as the univerſal parent, or author of all things.

31. *He gave them bread of heaven to eat*, αρτον εκ του ουρανου εδωκεν αυτοις φαγειν. E. T. *He gave them bread from heaven*

heaven to eat. The words are capable of being tranſlated either way. But *bread of heaven* appears to me an expreſſion of greater energy than *bread from heaven.* Beſides, it is more ſuitable to the paſſage in the Pſalms referred to, where it is called *corn of heaven* and *angel's food.*

32. *Moſes did not give you the bread of heaven,* ου Μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν τον αρτον εκ του ουρανου. E. T. *Moſes gave you not that bread from heaven.* Here, though the difference in expreſſion is but ſmall, the difference in meaning is conſiderable. The latter ſeems to point only to the place whence the manna came. The pronoun *that,* which is quite unwarranted, conduces much to this appearance. The former points to the true nature of that extraordinary food. Our Lord's declaration, as I imagine, imports, that it is in a ſubordinate ſenſe only that what dropped from the clouds, and was ſent for the nouriſhment of the body, ſtill mortal, could be called the bread of heaven, being but a type of that which hath deſcended from the heaven of heavens, for nouriſhing the immortal ſoul unto eternal life, and which is therefore, in the moſt ſublime ſenſe, *the bread of heaven.*

33. *That which deſcendeth from heaven,* ο καταβαινων εκ του ουρανου. E. T. *He who cometh down from heaven.* Let be obſerved, that ο αρτος, to which this participle refers, is of the maſculine gender, and, by conſequence, ſuſceptible of the interpretation I have given it. Let it be further obſerved, that this whole diſcourſe is figurative, and that it appears, from what follows, that our Lord meant not at once to lay aſide the veil wherein he had wrapped his ſentiments. The requeſt made to him in the very next verſe, *give us always this bread,* ſhows, that he was not yet underſtood as ſpeaking of a perſon, which he muſt have been, if his expreſſion had been as explicit as that of the E. T. It is only in verſe 35, that he tells them plainly, that he is himſelf the bread of which he had been ſpeaking. In this expoſition, I agree entirely with Dod. Hey. Wy. and Wor. and ſome of our beſt commentators.

39. *This is the will of him who ſent me,* τουτο εστι το θελημα του πεμψαντος με πατρος. But the word πατρος is wanting in the Al. and ſeveral other MSS. It is not found in the Cop. and Ara. verſions. The whole verſe is wanting in the Go. Several of the fathers alſo appear not to have read the word πατρος in this place; it is wanting alſo in many La. MSS. As this verſe is explanatory of the preceding, whereof a part is repeated, it ſuits the ordinary method of compoſition not to mention πατρος in this place, as it does not occur in the words referred to. Mill, and ſome other critics, agree in rejecting it.

41. *I am the bread which deſcended from heaven,* εγω ειμι ο αρτος ο καταβας εκ του ουρανου. Vul. *Ego ſum panis vivus qui de cœlo deſcendi.* The addition of *vivus,* in this place, has no ſupport from MSS. or verſions; no, not even the Sax. verſion.

45. *Every one who hath heard and learnt from the Father, cometh unto me,* πας ον ο ακουσας παρα του πατρος και μαθων ερχεται προς με. E. T. *Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Markland juſtly obſerves, that, as the preceding words are, *they ſhall be all taught of God,* it would have been more conſequential to ſubjoin, *every man, therefore, that cometh unto me, hath heard and learnt of the Father;* and there is no doubt that it is only in this way that the affirmation can be deduced, as a conſequence, from what preceded. But, in ſome MSS. of note, the illative particle ουν is not found; nor is there any thing correſponding to it in the Vul. Cop. Go. and Sax. verſions. Origen alſo omits it. Now, the omiſſion of this participle, corrects entirely the incoherency. In a caſe of this kind, where the connection is plainly injured by the particle, the reaſon above mentioned is ground ſufficient for excluding it; for it is plain, that tranſcribers have uſed more freedom with connexive particles, than with the other parts of ſpeech. And we may add, that thoſe of this claſs, in ſupplying ſuch helps, commonly do not conſult the underſtanding ſo much as the ear.

51. *Is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world,* η σαρξ μου εστιν ην εγω δωσω υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης. Vul. *Caro mea eſt pro mundi vita.* The clauſe ην εγω δωσω is wanting in three noted MSS. and in the Eth. and Sax. verſions, as well as in the Vul.

53. *Ye have not life in you,* ουκ εχετε ζωην εν εαυτοις. E. T. *Ye have no life in you.* The verſion I have given, is cleſer, both to the letter and to the ſenſe. *The life* ſpoken of, is called, both before and after, ζωη αιωνιος. The adjective, though ſometimes dropped, is always underſtood, whilſt the ſubject of diſcourſe continues to be the ſame. The import of our Lord's words is, therefore, not that there was no living principle of any ſort in thoſe who rejected him (though the expreſſion, in the common tranſlation, ſeems to imply as much), but that they had nothing of the life, about which he had been diſcourſing to them.

56. The Cam. MS. and one of Stephens's, after αυτω, add, καθως εν εμοι ο πατηρ, καγω εν τω πατρι. Αμην αμην λεγω υμιν εαν μη λαβητε το σωμα της υιης του ανθρωπου, ως τον αρτον της ζωης, ουκ εχετε ζωην εν αυτω. *As the Father is in me, and I am in the Father. Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, unleſs ye receive the body of the ſon of man as the bread of life, ye have not life in him.* That Dr. Mill ſhould, on ſo ſlight authority, even by his own account (Proleg. 1268, &c.), favour an addition which, as Whitby obſerves (Exam. Millii), has the ſanction of no eccleſiaſtical writer, no tranſlation, no commentary, and is, beſides, unſuitable to the ſtyle of the context, is truly amazing.

57. *As the Father liveth who ſent me, and I live by the Father; even ſo, he who eateth me, ſhall live by me* —καθως απεσταλκε με ὁ ζων πατηρ, καγω ζω δια τον πατερα· και ὁ τρωγων με, κακεινος ζησεται δι' εμε. E. T. *As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father; ſo he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me.* In the Oriental tongues, the preſent participle ſupplies the preſent of the indicative. We have an example of it in the above paſſage; but the illuſtration conveyed in that manner is more clearly expreſſed in modern tongues, when rendered by the indicative. I have, therefore, taken this method here, which is approved by Gro. and followed by Caſ. who ſays, *quemadmodum vivit pater qui me miſit.* Maldonat alſo explains it in the ſame manner. The clauſes, καθως απεσταλκε με ὁ ζων πατηρ, καγω ζω δια τον πατερα, make not a complete compariſon, but only, what I may call, one moiety of a compariſon, whereof what follows, και ὁ τρωγων με, κακεινος ζησεται δι' εμε, makes the other. A compariſon of the ſame taſte we have, ch. x. 14, 15. It muſt be owned, that δια, with the accuſative, commonly marks the final, not the efficient, cauſe, anſwering to the La. *propter*, not to *per*. But it is confeſſed on all ſides, that this does not always hold. The Vul. indeed, Er. and Zu. render it *propter;* Caſ. and Be. *per*. But even the expounders of the Vul. and tranſlators from it, conſider the prepoſition *propter* here, as equivalent to *per*. P. R. and Sa. render it in Fr. *par*, not *pour*. Maldonat and Si. admit that *propter* means here the ſame as *per*. The whole ſcope of the context is ſo manifeſtly favourable to this interpretation, and adverſe to the other, as to leave no reaſonable doubt.

69. *The ſon of the living God*, ὁ υιος του Θεου του ζωντος. Vul. *Filius Dei.* Του ζωντος is wanting in a few MSS. The ſame defect is found in the Cop. Arm. and Sax. verſions, as in the Vul. Nonnus alſo omits this epithet.

70. *A ſpy.* Diſſ. VI. P. I. § 4, 5, 6.

CHAP. VII.

8. *I go not yet*, εγω κτω αναβαινω. Vul. *Ego autem non aſcendo.* The Cam. and another MS. read ουκ for κτω. The Cop. Sax. and Eth. verſions read as the Vul.

12. *Much whiſpering*, γογγυσμος πολυς. E. T. *Much murmuring.* The word *murmuring* would, in this place, convey the notion of diſcontent, grumbling. This does not appear to be ſuggeſted by the original term. It expreſſes ſolely the ſecrecy and caution which the people found it convenient to uſe in ſpeaking on this ſubject, being prompted, not by their reſentments, but by their fears. Γογγυσμος, in this, ſtands in oppoſition to παρρησια in the next verſe.

15. *Whence cometh this man's learning?* πως ουτος γραμματα οιδε. An. *How came he acquainted with the Scriptures?* Some foreign tranſlators alſo render the words in the ſame manner. It was no doubt our Lord's acquaintance with the Scriptures, and reaſoning from them, which occaſioned the remark. But there appears no reaſon for confining the word γραμματα to this ſignification. Indeed, the expreſſion, τα ἱερα γραμματα, occurs, 2 Tim. iii. 15. in this ſenſe; but this is rather an argument againſt rendering it ſo here, where γραμματα has neither the epithet nor the article with which it is accompanied in that place. The article, for the ſake of emphaſis; invariably attends γραφη (which, without it, means no more than *a writing*), when it denotes *the Scriptures.* We cannot, then, think, that ſo vague a term as γραμματα, without any mark of diſtinction, would be uſed for the ſame purpoſe. Further, γραμματα, for denoting *letters*, or *learning* in general, occurs elſewhere, both in the N. T. and in the ancient verſion of the Old. See Acts xxvi. 24. Iſ. xxix. 11, 12; where it may be obſerved, that επισταμαι γραμματα is uſed in a way entirely ſimilar to the γραμματα οιδε of the paſſage under examination. Add to this, that, if our Lord had underſtood by γραμματα, *the Scriptures*, he would not ſurely, verſe 16th, have diſtinguiſhed the doctrine learnt from them, from the doctrine taught by the Father.

17. *Whoſoever is minded to do his will*, εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν. E. T. *If any man will do his will.* As the auxiliary *will* is often no more than a ſign of the future, it expreſſes but weakly the import of the verb θελω. To ſay, with An. and Hey. *is inclined*, or, with Wor. *if any man deſire*, is ſtill worſe; becauſe theſe expreſſions always denote a diſpoſition of mind which comes ſhort of a purpoſe or reſolution, and from which we can hardly premiſe any thing. Dod. ſays, *determined*, which is very good. I prefer, with Pearce, the word *minded*. Mt. xvi. 24. N. L. xii. 31. N.

18. *Is a ſtranger to deceit*, αδικια εν αυτω ουκ εστιν. in the uſe of the Seventy, αδικειν often denotes *to lie, to prevaricate to deceive*, and αδικια, *falſehood deceit*, which is evidently the moſt appoſite meaning in this place, where it is contraſted to αληθης. In this way, Beau. and ſome other late interpreters, have rendered the word.

21, 22. *I have performed one action which ſurpriſeth you all. Moſes inſtituted circumciſion amongſt you*, εν εργον εποιησα και παντες θαυμαζετε. Δια τουτο Μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν την περιτομην. E. T. *I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moſes, therefore, gave unto you circumciſion.* I have, with The. who is followed by ſome of our beſt critics, joined δι τουτο to the end of verſe 21. Nothing can be more incongruouſly connected than the words are in the Eng. and moſt other modern

tranſlations; where our Lord's performing a miracle is repreſented as the cauſe why Moſes gave them circumciſion. It is juſtly obſerved by Be. (though he has followed a different method in tranſlating) that if δια τουτο be conſtrued with θαυμαζετε, which makes an alteration only on the pointing, we have an example of the ſame conſtruction and arrangement with the ſame verb. Mr. vi. 6. εθαυμαζε δια την απιστιαν αυτων; *he wondered at their unbelief.* Different methods have been adopted by tranſlators, which, in my judgment, are forced and unnatural. The method here followed, is that taken by Dod. Weſ. Wy. and Wor.

22. *Circumciſe on the Sabbath.* The precept of circumciſion required that every male child ſhould be circumciſed the eighth day from his birth. Gen. xvii. 10, &c. Lev. xii. 3. Though the eighth day happened to be the Sabbath, this ceremony was not deferred; and the law of circumciſion vacated the law of the Sabbath.

24. *Judge not from perſonal regards,* μη κρινετε κατ' οψιν. E. T. *Judge not according to the appearance.* This phraſe is ambiguous. It may mean either the external circumſtances of the caſe, or the dignity of the parties concerned; but more readily conveys to our thoughts the former, than the latter of theſe ſignifications. Whereas οψις anſwers to the La. *facies*, and is equivalent to προσωπον, *face*, or *perſon*. It occurs only in two other places of the N. T. ch. xi. 44. and Rev. i. 16. In the one it is rendered *face*; in the other, *countenance*. It is often found in the Sep. in the ſame acceptation. There can be no queſtion that this precept is of the ſame import with thoſe which enjoin ſtrict impartiality between the parties, or to have no reſpect of perſons in judgment. The application of the precept is pretty obvious from the occaſion of it. If they had been ſtrictly impartial and equitable, they would have ſeen that they could not vindicate Moſes for enjoining ſuch a violation of the Sabbatical reſt as was occaſioned by circumciſing, whilſt they condemned Jeſus for his miraculous cures, which required leſs labour, and were not leſs evidently calculated for promoting a good end. Nay, they could not excuſe themſelves for the one practice, if Jeſus was blameable for the other.

26. *That this is the Meſſiah,* οτι ουτος εστιν αληθως ο Χριστος. E. T. *That this is the very Chriſt.* The word αληθως is wanting in many MSS.; amongſt which are the Cam. and others of note. It is not in the Com. and ſome other early editions; nor has it been read by ſome of the primitive writers. There is no word anſwering to it in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. verſions. The Sy. and the Eth. have each a word correſponding to it; but as they have none anſwering to the word αληθως, in the former part of the verſe (for the authenticity of which there is ſo general a conſent of MSS. fathers, and verſions), there is ſome ground to ſuſpect a tranſpoſition. On the whole, conſidering alſo that the word is unneceſſary, and, in this place, rather unſuitable to the ordinary ſtyle of the writer, I thought it better to omit it.

28. *Do ye know both who and whence I am?* καμε οιδατε, και οιδατε ποθεν ειμι. E. T. *Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am.* As the words are plainly capable of being read as an interrogation, it is, in every reſpect, moſt eligible to tranſlate them ſo in this place. In the way they are commonly rendered, they contain a direct contradiction to what our Lord ſays, ch. viii. 14. 19. Nor does it ſatisfy, that both may be true in different ſenſes, ſince theſe different ſenſes do not appear from the context. Nay, in effect, he contradicts them in the ſame breath; inaſmuch as he tells the people, that they know not him who ſent him. When they ſaid, *We know whence this man is*, the ſame thing was evidently meant as when they ſaid, ch. vi. 42. *Is not this Jeſus the ſon of Joſeph, whoſe father and mother we know?* Now, our Lord tells them plainly, that they do not know his father, and, conſequently, cannot tell whence (that is, of what parentage) he is. Dod. Weſ. Wy. render the words here interrogatively.

29. *He is true who ſent me,* εστιν αληθινος ο πεμψας με. There is generally obſerved in the N. T. a diſtinction between αληθης and αληθινος, when applied to perſons; the former anſwers to the La. *verax*, the latter to *verus*; the one means *obſervant of truth*, the other *genuine*. The words, therefore, are taught by Grotius, not improbably, to ſuggeſt that *the genuine father* of Jeſus, αληθινος οντα πατερα, was he who ſent him; the other, whom they knew was only νομιζομενος, *ſuppoſed* to be his father. Others think, that as *the true God*, in contradiſtinction to the falſe Gods of the nations, is ſometimes, in the ſacred books, called ο αληθινος Θεος, the epithet αληθινος is here employed to hint, to the attentive and intelligent hearers, that that Almighty Being, who alone is eminently denominated TRUE, is he who ſent him. In either caſe, it does not appear to have been our Saviour's intention to expreſs himſelf in ſuch a manner as to be equally intelligible to all. His own diſciples he brought, by little and little to the full knowledge of his doctrine. The ſpiritual, like the natural, day advances gradually. Now the tranſlator ought, as much as he can, to adopt the views of his author.

32. *The chief prieſts,* οι αρχιερεις. Vul. *Principes.* In conformity to this verſion, two MSS. of little account, read αρχοντες. The Sax. verſion follows the Vul.

33. *Jeſus, therefore, ſaid,* ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο Ιησους. E. T. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto them.* So great a number of MSS. editions, verſions, fathers, and critics, reject αυτοις in this place, as leave no reaſonable ground to think, that it has originally belonged to it. When we conſider

alſo

alſo the ſcope of the paſſage, we find it would be improper; for this diſcourſe muſt certainly have been directed, not to the officers of the Phariſees, but to the people.

38. *He who believeth on me, as Scripture ſaith, ſhall prove a ciſtern whence rivers of living water ſhall flow,* ὁ πιστευων εις εμε, καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, ποταμοι εκ της κοιλιας αυτου ρευσουσιν ὑδατος ζωντος. E. T. *He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath ſaid, out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water.* As commentators have been at a loſs to find the portion of Scripture here referred to, ſome have joined καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη to the clauſe ὁ πιστευων εις εμε which immediately precedes, and thus rendered the words, *He who believeth on me ſo as the Scripture hath commanded,* making the latter clauſe ſerve to qualify the former, that it may be underſtood that not every ſort of believer is meant, but he whoſe belief is of ſuch a particular kind. For my part, I do not find any inſinuation in Scripture, that there are, or can be, different ways of believing. Belief may indeed have very different objects. But as to the act of the mind called *believing*, it is always mentioned in holy writ with the ſame ſimplicity that ſeeing, hearing, underſtanding, and remembering, are mentioned. Nor does there appear the leaſt ſuſpicion in the writer, that any one of theſe ſhould be miſunderſtood by the reader more than any other. The above mentioned is one of thoſe criticiſms which ſpring entirely from controverſial theology: for, if there had not been previouſly different definitions of faith adopted by different parties of Chriſtians, ſuch a manner of interpreting the words had never been deviſed. Doubtleſs, therefore, καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, is to be explained in the uſual way, as referring to ſome ſcriptural promiſe or prediction, of which what is here told would prove the accompliſhment. Houbigant thinks that the paſſage alluded to is in one of Balaam's prophecies, Num. xxiv. 7. which he tranſlates in this manner: *De præcordiis ejus aquæ manabunt.* He ſays ſome plauſible things in ſupport of his opinion, which it would be foreign to my purpoſe to examine here. I have had occaſion formerly to obſerve, that by ſuch phraſes as καθως ειπεν ἡ γραφη, a particular paſſage of Scripture is not always referred to, but the ſcope of different paſſages is given.

39. *The ſpirit was not yet* [*given*], ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα ἁγιον. E. T. *For the Holy Ghoſt was not yet given.* Vul. *Nondum enim erat ſpiritus datus.* Αγιον is wanting in ſeveral MSS. Origen, Cyril, Heſychius, and Nonnus, ſeem not to have read it. There is nothing correſponding to it in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. verſions. It is rejected alſo by ſome of the beſt modern critics. Though there is no word for *given* in the common Gr. it is in the Vat. MS. the Vul. both the Sy. and the Sax. It ſeems neceſſary, in order to complete the ſenſe. The evidence in its favour would otherwiſe be inſufficient.

43. *The people were divided,* σχισμα εν τω οχλω εγενετο. Diſſ. X. P. III. § 2.

48. *Of the Phariſees.* Diſſ. IX. P. IV. § 6.

52. *Search,* ερευνησον. Vul. *Scrutari Scripturas.* The only voucher for this variation is the Cam. MS. which adds τας γραφας. No verſion whatever favours it.

52. *That prophets ariſe not out of Galilee,* ὁτι προφητης εκ της Γαλιλαιας ουκ εγειρεται. E. T. *For out of Galilee ariſeth no prophet.* A great number of MSS. read εγηγερται, and ſeveral verſions, the Vul. both the Sy. the Goth. and the Sax. render the words in ſuch a manner as though they had read ſo: Nonnus alſo ſays εγειρεται. But we cannot, from this, conclude with certainty that they read ſo: for a freedom no greater than the change of the tenſe in verbs, muſt be ſometimes taken, eſpecially in tranſlating a writer who uſes the tenſes with ſuch peculiarity of idiom as this Evangeliſt. It is enough here, that it appears to have been the general ſenſe of interpreters, that the verb was to be underſtood in the preſent. Indeed, moſt of the modern tranſlators, and among the reſt the Eng. have in this followed the ancient. It has not a little puzzled expoſitors to account for ſo general an aſſertion from the leading men of the nation, ſince it is highly probable that Jonah at leaſt aroſe out of Galilee. On this article I obſerve, firſt, that our tranſlators have rendered the expreſſion more abſolute than they were warranted by the Gr. It is there literally, *A prophet ariſeth not.* They ſay, *No prophet ariſeth.* There is a real difference here. The former, in common ſpeech, denotes no more than that it is not uſual; the latter, that it never happens. I have rendered it, in my opinion, more agreeably to the ſenſe, and more ſuitably to our idiom by the plural number. I obſerve, 2dly, That men, when their paſſions are inflamed, are not wont to be accurate in their expreſſions, or diſtinct in recollecting, on the ſudden, things which make againſt them. This expreſſion of the Phariſees, therefore, whom prejudice, pride, and envy concurred in blinding, needs not appear ſo ſurpriſing to us. The expedient, to which Biſhop Pearce and others have recurred, of prefixing the article to προφητης, without the authority of a ſingle MS. or of a quotation from any ancient author, is, of all reſources, the worſt. Here it would hurt, inſtead of mending, the reply. Admit that Jeſus had been but a prophet, and not the Meſſiah, was there no crime, or was there no danger, in forming a plan to deſtroy him? By ſuch a correction one would make them ſpeak, as if it were their opinion, that they might ſafely take the life of an innocent man, even though a prophet of God, if he was not the Meſſiah. The reaſon of their mentioning a prophet was, becauſe our Lord, by pretending a divine commiſſion, had claſſed himſelf among prophets, and therefore had given reaſon to infer, that if he was not a prophet, he was an impoſtor, and conſequently merited the fate they intended for him. For the

the law, Deut. xviii. 20. had expreſsly declared, that the prophet who ſhould preſume to ſpeak a word in the name of God, which he had not commanded him to ſpeak, that prophet ſhould die. Now, they had, on their hypotheſis, ſpecious ground for making the remark, as it ſerved to vindicate their deſigns againſt his life. But the whole of their argument is marred by making it *the prophet;* for our Lord was not yet underſtood to have publicly and explicitly declared himſelf the Meſſiah.

53. [*Then every man went.*—See the note immediately following.

CHAP. VIII.

1—11.] The firſt eleven verſes of this, with the concluding verſe of the former chapter, containing the ſtory of the adultreſs, are wanting in a great number of MSS. Origen, Chr. The. the Gr. *catena*, though containing no fewer than three and twenty authors, have not read theſe twelve verſes. Euth. a commentator, ſo late as the twelfth century, is the firſt who has explained them. At the ſame time he aſſures us, in his commentary, that they are not to be found in the moſt correct copies. They were not in any good copy of either of the Sy. verſions, printed or MS. till they were printed in the Eng. Polyglot, from a MS. of Archbiſhop Uſher. They are neither in the Go. nor in the Cop. They have been long read by the Greeks in their churches, are in moſt of the MSS. found with them at preſent; although in ſome of them they are marked with aſteriſks or daggers, to ſhow that they are conſidered as ſpurious. If they be an interpolation, they are a very ancient one, having been found in ſome copies before Origen. Some have repreſented them as having been tranſcribed from the Apocryphal Goſpel according to the Hebrews; others have aſcribed them to Papias, who flouriſhed in the beginning of the ſecond century. Many of the beſt critics and expoſitors of oppoſite ſects have entertained ſtrong ſuſpicions of them. Such are Er. Olivetan, Cajetan, Bucer, Cal. Be. Gro. Ham. L. Cl. The words of Be. are remarkable; I ſhall, therefore, tranſcribe them here. "Ad me quidem quod attinet, non "diſſimulo mihi merito ſuſpectum eſſe quod veteres "illi tanto conſenſu vel rejecerunt, vel ignorarunt. "Deinde quod narrat Jeſum ſolum fuiſſe relictum "cum muliere in templo, neſcio quàm ſit probabile: "nec ſatis cohæret cum eo quod mox, id eſt, verſu "duodecimo dicitur, eos rurſum alloquutus; et quod "ſcribit, Jeſum digito ſcripſiſſe in terra, novum "mihi et inſolens videtur, nec poſſum conjicere quo-"modo poſſit, ſatis commodè explicari. Tanta de-"nique lectionis varietas facit ut de totius iſtius "narrationis fide dubitem." To the expoſitors above mentioned, I might almoſt add the Jeſuit Maldonat, conſidered in his critical capacity, though, as a true ſon of the church, he declares himſelf on the contrary ſide. For, after fairly deducing the evidences, which are urged for the rejection of this ſtory, he produces, as a counterbalance, the ſingle authority of the council of Trent, and appears to make a merit of ſacrificing to it every thing that might be urged from reaſon on the oppoſite ſide. "Sed hæc omnia," meaning the evidences he had given of the ſpuriouſneſs of the paſſage, "minus habent ponderis, quam una auctoritas "eccleſiæ, quæ per concilium Tridentinum, non ſo-"lum libros omnes quos nunc habet in uſu, ſed "ſingulas etiam ejus partes, tanquam canonicas ap-"probavit." But in this implicit deference to authority, Maldonat has not preſerved an uniform conſiſtency. See the note on ch. xxi. 22, 23. There are ſome ſtrong internal preſumptions, as well as external, againſt the authenticity of the paſſage. They who deſire to enter farther into the queſtion, may conſult Si.'s Crit. Hiſt. of the Text of the N. T. ch. xiii. and Wet. on the place. Let them alſo read, for the ſake of impartiality, Biſhop Pearce's note C, on verſe 11, and his other notes and remarks on the whole ſtory; and if they think with him, that all, or the chief objections made by Wet. againſt the authenticity of the ſtory are fully anſwered, they will naturally adopt the Biſhop's opinion.

6. *Was writing with his finger upon the ground,* τω δακτυλω εγραφεν εις την γην. E. T. *With his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not.* This is one of the few inſtances in which our tranſlators have deſerted the common Gr. and even the La. in deference to the authority of MSS. a good number of which, and ſome of the early editions, after γην read μη προσποιουμενος; but this clauſe is not in any tranſlation, that I have ſeen, of an earlier date than Dio.'s. Being, beſides, quite unneceſſary, I thought it better to follow the common editions both Gr. and La.

9. *They hearing that withdrew,* οι δε, ακουσαντες και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι, εξηρχοντο. E. T. *And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conſcience, went out.* The clauſe και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι is wanting in many MSS. ſome of the beſt editions, and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Eth. verſions.

10. *And ſeeing none but the woman,* και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος. This clauſe is wanting in the Cam. and four other MSS. and alſo in the Vul. Sy. Sax. Cop. and Arm. verſions. The ſenſe, however, ſeems to require it.

10. *Hath nobody paſſed ſentence on thee?* ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν. E. T. *Hath no man condemned thee?*

11. *Neither do I paſs ſentence on thee,* ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω. E. T. *Neither do I condemn thee.* The Eng. word *condemn* is uſed with ſo great latitude of ſignification for *blaming, diſapproving*, as well as *paſſing ſentence againſt;* that I thought it better, in order to avoid

avoid occaſion of miſtaking, to uſe a periphraſis which hits exactly the meaning of the Gr. word in theſe two verſes.

15. *Ye judge from paſſion,* ὑμεις κατα την σαρκα κρινετε. E. T. *Ye judge after the fleſh.* Σαρξ, in the language of the N. T. is frequently uſed to denote the inferior powers of the ſoul, the paſſions and appetites, and is in this meaning oppoſed to πνευμα, which denotes the ſuperior faculties of reaſon and conſcience. Thus, κατα σαρκα περιπατειν, is to act habitually under the influence of paſſion and appetite. Though, from the uſe of the common verſion, we are habituated to the phraſe *after the fleſh,* to the much greater number it conveys no diſtinct meaning. It only ſuggeſts ſomething which in general is bad. Diſſ. I. P. I. § 11. N. § 14. N.

24. *Ye ſhall die in your ſins;* that is, *impenitent, hardened.* It may alſo denote, that they ſhould die ſuffering the puniſhment of their ſins. In this explanation it conveys a prediction of the deſtruction of their city and ſtate, in which it is not improbable that ſome of our Lord's hearers on this occaſion, afterwards periſhed.

25. *The ſame that I told you formerly,* την αρχην ὁ, τι και λαλω ὑμιν. The E. T. is in effect the ſame; την αρχην for κατα την αρχην, is entirely in the Gr. idiom, for *in the beginning formerly.* In this way it is uſed by the Seventy, Gen. xiii. 4. xliii. 18. 20. Dan. viii. 1. In this way it is explained by Nonnus.

Ὁ ’στι περ ὑμιν
Εξ αρχης αοριζον.

When we have ſuch authority at hand for the meaning of the word (the beſt of all authorities for ſcriptural uſe), I ſee no occaſion for recourſe to profane authors. Miſled by theſe, Dod. has in this ſtrange manner rendered the paſſage, *Truly, becauſe I am ſpeaking to you, I have many things to ſay and judge concerning you,* in which it is not in my power to diſcover any meaning or coherence. Firſt, we have no anſwer given to the queſtion put; 2dly, we have things introduced as cauſe and effect, which ſeem but ill-fitted to ſtand together in that relation. How could his ſpeaking to them be the cauſe of his having many things to judge concerning them?

27. *That he meant the Father,* ὁτι τον πατερα αυτοις ελεγεν. Vul. *Quia patrem ejus dicebat Deum.* The Cam. MS. adds, τον Θεον, which, with the Sax. verſion, ſeem to be in this place the only teſtimonies in favour of the Vul.

28. *Then ye ſhall know what I am,* τοτε γνωσεσθε ὁτι εγω ειμι. E. T. *Then ſhall ye know that I am he.* With Gro. I underſtand the third word as thus divided, ὁ, τι, which is the ſame as τι, *quid, what.* In this way there is a direct reference to the queſtion put, verſe 25, *Who art thou?* It has this advantage alſo, that it leaves no ellipſis to be ſupplied for completing the ſenſe; and the connection is both cloſer and clearer than in the common verſion. L. Cl. has taken this method in rendering the words into Fr. *Alors vous connoitrez ce que je ſuis.* P. R. and Sa. though tranſlating from the Vul. which ſays, *quia ego ſum,* go ſtill nearer the terms of the queſtion, and ſay, *qui je ſuis,* who I am. In Eng. the An. and Hey. follow L. Cl. as I alſo have done. In this way the full import of the words is given with ſufficient clearneſs.

33. *Some made anſwer,* απεκριθησαν αυτω. E. T. *They anſwered him.* The whole ſcope of the place ſhows, that it was not thoſe believers to whom Jeſus had addreſſed himſelf in the two preceding verſes, who are here repreſented as anſwering. But ſuch expreſſions as ελεγον, απεκριθησαν, are ſometimes uſed indefinitely, and import only *it was ſaid, it was anſwered.* What follows evinces that they were far from being believers who made this anſwer.

38. *Ye do what ye have learnt from your father,* ὑμεις ων ὁ ἑωρακατε παρα τω πατρι ὑμων ποιειτε. E. T. *Ye do that which you have ſeen with your father.* But in a conſiderable number of MSS. ſome of them of note, for ἑωρακατε, we read ηκουσατε. It was ſo read by Origen and Cyril. It is followed by the Eth. Cop. Go. and ſecond Sy. verſions. I agree with Biſhop Pearce in thinking this reading preferable in point of propriety. It is for this reaſon, which is of the nature of internal evidence, that I have adopted the correction otherwiſe not ſtrongly ſupported.

43. *It is becauſe ye cannot bear my doctrine,* ὁτι ου δυνασθε ακουειν τον λογον τον εμον. E. T. *Even becauſe ye cannot hear my word.* The verb ακουειν denotes frequently in Scripture, and even in profane authors, not barely *to hear,* but *to hear patiently;* conſequently *not to hear* often means *not to bear.* The Eng. verb. *to hear,* has ſometimes, I acknowledge the ſame meaning, but more rarely: and in conſequence of the uncommonneſs, the literal verſion has ſomewhat of an ambiguous appearance which the original has not. The An. Hey. and Wor. have all avoided the ambiguity, though not quite in the ſame manner.

44. *He was a manſlayer,* εκεινος ανθρωποκτονος ην. E. T. *He was a murderer.* The common term for murderer in the N. T. is φονευς. I have here made choice of a leſs uſual name, not from any diſpoſition to trace etymologies, but becauſe I think it is not without intention, that the devil, a being not of earthly extraction, is rather called ανθρωποκτονος than φονευς, as marking, with greater preciſion, his ancient enmity to the human race. When the name *murderer* is applied to a rational being of a ſpecies different from ours, it naturally ſuggeſts that the being ſo denominated is a deſtroyer of others of his own ſpecies. As this is not meant here, the Evangeliſt's term is peculiarly appo-

ſite. At the ſame time I am ſenſible, that our word *manſlaughter* means, in the language of the law, ſuch killing as is indeed criminal, though not ſo atrocious as *murder*. But in common uſe it is not ſo limited. Hey. ſays, to the ſame purpoſe, *a ſlayer of men*.

45. *Becauſe I ſpeak the truth, ye do not believe me,* ὁτι την αληθειαν λεγω, ου πιστευετε μοι. Vul. *Si veritatem dico non creditis mihi.* This verſion, one would almoſt think, muſt have ariſen from a different reading, though there is none entirely conformable to it in the known MSS. and verſions. It may, indeed, be thought an objection againſt the common reading, that there is ſomething like exaggeration in the ſentiment. How is it poſſible that a man's reaſon for not believing what is told him, ſhould be *that it is true?* That this ſhould be his known or acknowledged reaſon, is certainly impoſſible. To think or perceive a thing to be true, and to believe it, are expreſſions entirely ſynonymous. In this way explained, it would, no doubt, be a contradiction in terms. The truth of the matter may, nevertheleſs, be the real, though, with regard to himſelf, the unknown, cauſe of his unbelief. A man's mind may, by groſs errors and inveterate prejudices, be ſo alienated from the ſimplicity of truth, that the ſilleſt paradoxes, or wildeſt extravagancies, in opinion, ſhall have a better chance of gaining his aſſent, than truths almoſt ſelf-evident. And this is all that, in ſtrictneſs, is implied in the reproach.

46. *Which of you convicteth me?* τις εξ υμων ελεγχει με. E. T. *Which of you convinceth me?* The word *convinceth* is not the proper term in this place. It relates only to the opinion of the perſon himſelf about whom the queſtion is. Our Lord here, in order to ſhow that the unbelief of his hearers had no reaſonable excuſe, challanges them openly, to *convict* him, if they could, in any inſtance, of a deviation from truth. The import of this is, bring evidence of ſuch a deviation, evince it to the world. A man may be convinced, that is not convicted. Nay, it is even poſſible that a man may be convicted, who is not convinced. I am aſtoniſhed that Dod. has miſſed obſerving this diſtinction. He is almoſt the only modern tranſlator into Eng. who has miſſed it.

2. *Of falſehood,* περι αμαρτιας. E. T. *Of ſin.* Αμαρτια not only ſignifies *ſin* in the largeſt acceptation, but *error, falſehood,* a departure from truth. Its being contraſted here to αληθεια, fixes it to this ſenſe. It immediately follows. *And if I ſpeak truth, why do ye not believe me?*

51. *Shall never ſee death,* θανατον ου μη θεωρηση εις τον αιωνα. Hey. *Shall not die for ever.* This is at leaſt a very unuſual expreſſion. If *not for ever* do not here mean *never,* it would not be eaſy, from the known laws of the language, to aſſign its preciſe meaning. But the ſenſe, ſay they, is, *He ſhall not periſh eternally. He ſhall not ſuffer eternal death.* I admit that this is the meaning which our Lord had to the expreſſion he then uſed. But this meaning is as clearly conveyed in the E. T. as in the Greek original. Now, if we could make the expreſſion clearer in Eng. than it is in Gr. we ought not, in the preſent caſe, to do it; becauſe we cannot do it, without hurting the ſcope of the writer in recording this dialogue, which ſhows the manner wherein our Lord, whilſt he taught his faithful followers, was miſunderſtood by his enemies. The probability, nay, even the poſſibility, of ſome of their miſtakes will be deſtroyed, if his expreſſions be totally diveſted of their darkneſs, or even ambiguity. Our Lord ſpoke, doubtleſs, of eternal death, when he ſaid θανατον ου μη θεωρηση, but, it is certain, that he was underſtood by moſt of his hearers as ſpeaking of natural death; the words then ought to be ſuſceptible of this interpretation. He perceived their miſtake, but did not think proper to make any change on his language. The only equivocal word here is θανατος, *death.* Εις τον αιωνα, with a negative particle, when the ſenſe is not confined by the verb, has invariably the ſame meaning, which is *never.* See Mt. xxi. 19. Mr. iii. 29. J. iv. 14. x. 28. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. viii. 13. I ſaid, when the ſenſe is not confined by the verb, becauſe when the verb implies duration, the meaning of the phraſe is different; for it then denotes *not always, not perpetually.* We have an example in this chapter, verſe 35. ὁ δε δουλος ου μενει εν τη οικια εις τον αιωνα. *Now the ſlave abideth not in the family perpetually.* Theſe two, therefore, *never,* and *not perpetually,* are the only acceptations in Scripture I have diſcovered of the phraſe. Now it cannot be the latter of theſe that has been meant by Hey.; and if the former, he has not been happy in the choice of an expreſſion, ch. ix. 32. N.

55. *Speak falſely.* Diſſ. III. § 24.

56. *Longed to ſee my day,* ηγαλλιασατο ινα ιδη την ημεραν την εμην. E. T. *Rejoiced to ſee my day.* The words ινα ιδη, immediately following ηγαλλιασατο, ſhow that it cannot mean here *rejoiced,* but *deſired* earneſtly, *wiſhed, longed.* It is ſo rendered by the Sy. ממה. Nonnus, to the ſame purpoſe,

Ημαρ εμον πολυευκτον ιδειν ηγαλλετο θυμω.

The Vul. Er. and Zu. ſay *exultavit,* but both Caſ. and Be. *geſtivit.* L. Cl. Beau. and almoſt all the late Eng. interpreters; nay, and even the moſt eminent Fr. tranſlators from the Vul. as P. R. Sa. and Si. follow in this the interpretation of Be. and Caſ.

2. *He ſaw.* His faith was equivalent to ſeeing.

57. *And thou haſt ſeen Abraham?* και Αβρααμ εωρακας. E. T. *And haſt thou ſeen Abraham?* The form I have given to the interrogation which is ſtill retained, is more expreſſive of the deriſive manner in which the queſtion ſeems to have been put. Mt. xxvii. 11. with the N.

58. *Before*

58. *Before Abraham was born, I am,* πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι εγω ειμι. E. T. *Before Abraham was, I am.* I have followed here the verſion of Er. which is cloſe both to the ſenſe and to the letter: *Antequam Abraham naſceretur, ego ſum.* Dio. renders the words in the ſame way in Italian: *Avanti che Abraam foſſe nato, io ſono.* Dod. Hey. and Wy. tranſlate in Eng. in the ſame manner. Εγω ειμι may indeed be rendered *I was.* The preſent, for the imperfect, or even for the preterperfect, is no unuſual figure with this writer. However, as an uninterrupted duration from the time ſpoken of to the time then preſent, ſeems to have been ſuggeſted, I thought it better to follow the common method.

59. The E. T. adds, *and ſo paſſed by.* In the common Gr. we have και παρηγεν ουτως. But theſe words are not in the Cam. MS. nor in ſome of the early editions. There is nothing correſponding to them in the Sy. Vul. or Sax. verſions. Caſ. and Lu. have them not. Be. conſiders both this, and the clauſe immediately preceding, to wit, *paſſing through the midſt of them,* which is alſo wanting in ſome verſions, as mere interpolations. He has, nevertheleſs, retained them in his tranſlation. They are rejected by Gro. and Mill. It may be ſaid that one of theſe clauſes at leaſt (if not both) adds nothing to the ſenſe: they have much the appearance of having been copied from other Goſpels.

CHAP. IX.

2. *Who ſinned, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?* Diſſ. VI. P. II. § 19.

7. *Waſh thine eyes in the pool of Siloam,* νιψαι εις την κολυμβηθραν του Σιλωαμ. E. T. *Waſh in the pool of Siloam.* There are two words which occur in the N. T. in the ſenſe of *waſhing* or *bathing;* yet they are not ſynonymous, though we have not terms which correſpond ſo exactly as to mark the diſtinction between them. The words are νιπτειν and λουειν. The former, νιπτειν, or rather νιπτεσθαι (for the middle voice is more uſed), denotes to waſh or bathe a part only of the body; the latter, λουειν, is to waſh or bathe the whole body. This difference, if I miſtake not, is uniformly obſerved in the N. T. Thus, Mt. vi. 17. το προσωπον σου νιψαι xv. 2. ου νιπτονται τας χειρας αυτων. And in this goſpel the diſtinction is expreſsly marked, ch. xiii. 10. ο λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει ει μη τους ποδας νιψασθαι, where the participle λελουμενος is uſed of him whoſe whole body is waſhed; and the verb νιψασθαι is joined with τους ποδας. That the verb λουειν is commonly uſed in the manner mentioned, ſee Acts, ix. 37. Heb. x. 22. 2 Pet. ii. 22. Rev. i. 5. In all which, whether the words be uſed literally or metaphorically, the complete cleanſing of the body or perſon is meant. There is only one paſſage about which there can be any doubt. It is in Acts, xvi. 33. where the jailor, upon his converſion by Paul and Silas, priſoners committed to his cuſtody, is ſaid in the E. T. to have waſhed their ſtripes. The verb is ελουσεν. But let it be obſerved, that this is not an accurate verſion of the Gr. phraſe ελουσεν απο των πληγων, which, in my opinion, implies bathing the whole body, for the ſake both of cleaning their wounds, and adminiſtering ſome relief to their perſons. The accuſative of the active verb ελουσεν is evidently τα σωματα underſtood. The full expreſſion is ελουσι τα σωματα αυτων απο των πληγων. The ſame diſtinction between the words is well obſerved in the Sep. The word *waſh,* in Eng. when uſed as a neuter verb, without a regimen, is commonly, if not always, underſtood to relate to the whole body. The word νιψαι ſhows, on the contrary, that the ſacred author meant only a part. That the part meant is *the eyes,* is manifeſt from the context. Not to ſupply them, therefore, in Eng. is in effect to alter the ſenſe. Nonnus, agreeably to this expoſition, ſays νιπτει κεινον ρεθρος. And when the man himſelf relates to the people, verſe 11, how he had been cured, Nonnus thus expreſſes this circumſtance:

Νιψαμενος σκιεροιο περιτροχον ομματος ὑλην.

And afterwards, verſe 15, to the Phariſees he ſays, ὑδατι πηλον νιψα. Mr. vii. 3, 4. N.

8. *They who had before ſeen him blind,* οι θεωρουντες αυτον το προτερον ὁτι τυφλος ην. Vul. *Qui viderunt eum prius quia mendicus erat.* Conformable to this are the Al. Cam. and ſeveral other MSS. which, inſtead of τυφλος, read προσαιτης. Moſt of the ancient verſions agree in this with the Vul. It makes no material difference in the ſtory.

9. *Others, He is like him,* αλλοι δε, οτι ὁμοιος αυτω ἐστιν. Vul. *Alii autem, Nequaquam, ſed ſimilis eſt ei.* In conformity to this, four MSS. inſtead of ὁτι read ουχι αλλ'. The Sy. and ſome other verſions agree alſo with the Vul.

16. Σχισμα ην εν αυτοις. Diſſ. IX. P. III. § 2.

17. *What ſayeſt thou of him for giving thee ſight?* Συ τι λεγεις περι αυτου ὁτι ηνοιξε σου τους οφθαλμους. E. T. *What ſayeſt thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?* Vul. *Tu quid dicis de illo qui aperuit oculos tuos?* It would appear that the La. tranſlator has read ὁς for ὁτι. It ſuits the ſenſe very well, but has no ſupport from MSS. verſions, or ancient authors. The common reading is unexceptionable; but the expreſſion in the E. T. does not convey the meaning ſo diſtinctly as could be wiſhed. The ſenſe is well expreſſed by Ham. in his paraphraſe. "What opinion of him hath this "work of power and mercy to thee, wrought in "thee?"

22. *Should be expelled the ſynagogue,* αποσυναγωγος γενηται. This correſponds, in their diſcipline, to what we call *excommunication.*

24. *Give*

24. *Give glory to God*, Δος δοξαν τω Θεω. This does not mean, as is commonly ſuppoſed, 'Give God the 'praiſe for thy cure.' The import is, 'Glorify God 'by confeſſing ingenuouſly the truth.' This expreſſion ſhows that they believed, or affected to believe, that he had told them lies, and that they wanted to extort a confeſſion from him. It was the expreſſion uſed by Joſhua, ch. vii. 18, 19. to Achan, when he would induce him to confeſs his guilt in relation to the accurſed thing. It was adopted afterwards by the judges, for adjuring thoſe accuſed or ſuſpected of crimes to acknowledge the truth as in the ſight of God. What follows entirely ſuits this ſenſe. Their ſpeech is to this effect: 'You cannot impoſe upon us by this incredible 'ſtory. We know that the man you ſpeak of, who 'openly profanes the Sabbath, is a tranſgreſſor, and 'therefore can have no authority or commiſſion from 'God: It will, therefore, be the wiſeſt thing you 'can do, to confeſs the truth honeſtly, as thereby you 'will give glory to God.' It would appear from their tampering ſo much with this man, that they hoped by his means to detect ſome fraud or colluſion, by the uſe of which our Lord had procured ſo extraordinary a fame for working miracles. But being diſappointed in their expectations from him, they were ſo incenſed that they reſolved immediately to excommunicate him.

27. *Did ye not hear?* και ουκ ηκουσατε. E. T. *And ye did not hear.* Vul. *Et audiſtis.* This tranſlator has read και ηκουσατε; a reading which has no ſupport from antiquity, except the Sax. verſion. I think the clauſe ought to be read as a queſtion, a manner frequent in this Goſpel. If it be rendered in the common way, it muſt mean, 'Ye did not mind what 'was told you.' If ſo, the verb ακουειν is uſed twice in the ſame verſe in ſenſes totally different. Such an interpretation as ſuppoſes this, unleſs when a paronomaſia is evidently intended, ought to be avoided as much a poſſible.

32. *Never was it heard before*, εκ του αιωνος ουκ ηκουσθη. Απ' αιωνος, or εκ του αιωνος, is a literal verſion frequently occurring in the Sep. of the Heb. word מעולם in like manner as εις το αιωνα, or εως του αιωνος is of לעולם. The former ſtrictly means *from eternity*, the latter *to eternity*. In this ſenſe they are applied to God, Pſ. xc. 2. But in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from the early times; and εις τον αιωνα does not always mean *to eternity*, in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word. That the uſe is nearly the ſame in pagan writers, has been very well ſhown by Wet. The meaning of neither phraſe, when accompanied with a negative, admits much variation. The one is *antehac nunquam, never before*; the other *nunquam dehinc, never after*. In regard to the latter, an exception was taken notice of, on ch. viii. 51. Such an interpretation as *from the age*, which ſome have propoſed, conveys no meaning where no particular age has been ſpoken of. Nor is there any age of the world, that appears to have been diſtinguiſhed in Scripture as *the age*, by way of eminence. But a great deal of the reaſoning uſed in criticiſm, eſpecially ſcriptural criticiſm, is merely hypothetical.

34. *Thou waſt altogether born in ſins, and doſt thou teach us?* This reproach proceeded from the ſame general principle from which the queſtion of the diſciples, verſe 2. aroſe.

CHAP. X.

2. *The ſhepherd always entereth by the door*, ο δε εισερχομενος δια της θυρας, ποιμην εστι των προβατων. E. T. *But he that entereth in by the door is the ſhepherd of the ſheep.* This mode of ſpeaking with us conveys the notion, that the ſhepherd is the only perſon who enters by the door; yet the door-keeper, and the ſheep themſelves, alſo enter the ſame way. The original expreſſion is manifeſtly intended to denote the conſtant, not the peculiar uſe which the ſhepherd makes of the door, as oppoſed to the conſtant uſe of thieves and robbers to force their entrance, by breaking or climbing over the fence. The compariſon is made not to the folds uſed by the common people in remote parts of the country, but to thoſe belonging to the rich in the neighbourhood of a populous city, where the walls and other fences need to be ſtronger, and the entrance more carefully kept, on account of the greater danger from thieves.

8. *All who have entered in another manner*, παντες οσοι προ εμου, ηλθον. E. T. *All that ever came before me.* But there is a remarkable difference of reading on this paſſage. The words προ εμου, on which the meaning of the ſentence entirely depends, are wanting in ſome of the moſt ancient, and in a very great number of other MSS. There is nothing correſponding to them in the Vul. which ſays ſimply, *Omnes quotquot venerunt.* The firſt Sy. in like manner, has them not: the ſecond Sy. has an expreſſion anſwering to them; but it is marked, as ſpurious, with an aſteriſk. Neither the Go. nor the Sax. has them. They are wanting in the Com. and ſome other early editions. Moſt of the ancient expoſitors appear not to have read them. Some, however, have. Among theſe is Nonnus, who ſays, παντες οσοι παρος ηλθον. This is the ſtate of the external evidence, with regard to the words in queſtion. And if it be found ſuch as to leave the mind in ſuſpenſe about their authenticity, the internal evidence againſt them does, in my opinion, turn the ſcale. When our Lord, in explaining his public character, uſes a compariſon introduced by the words *I am*, it is always his manner to ſuit what he next ſays of himſelf, to that, whatever it be, he has choſen to be repreſented by. Of this we have ſeveral examples in this Goſpel. Thus, when he ſays, ch. vi. 51. *I am the living bread which deſcended from heaven*, it is immediately added, *Whoſo eateth of this bread*—This perfectly

ſectly ſuits the compariſon adopted; for *bread* is baked to be *eaten*. Again, ch. xiv. 6. *I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me* [who am *the way*]. Again, ch. xv. 1. *I am the true vine, and my Father is the vine-dreſſer.* It is added, *Every barren branch in me* [*the vine*] *he loppeth off.* To come to the context, verſe 11. *I am the good ſhepherd;* it follows, *the good ſhepherd giveth his life for the ſheep;* and, laſtly, verſe 9. *I am the door; ſuch as enter by me* [*the door*] *ſhall be ſafe.*——Now to this manner, ſo uniformly obſerved, the words under examination cannot be reconciled. *I am the door, all that ever came before me,* προ εμε, that is, before I *the door came.* But do we ever ſpeak of *a door's coming* to any place? This is ſo far from illuſtrating the meaning, that it is inconſiſtent with any meaning, and therefore leads the mind to deviſe ſome other image which may ſuit the words here uſed. Such, indeed, is that employed, verſe, 11. where our Lord calls himſelf *the ſhepherd.* But by no rule of interpretation can we borrow light from a circumſtance which had not yet been mentioned. Of this incoherence Maldonat, though he explains the words differently, was entirely ſenſible. *Non videntur hæc enim,* ſays he, *cum præcedenti verſu ſatis aptè conjungi. Si enim dixiſſet ſe paſtorem eſſe, commode et appoſitè adderet alios non paſtores ſed fures et latrones fuiſſe; cum autem dixerit ſe eſſe oſtium, non apparet qua ratione, qua conſequentia addat alios fuiſſe latrones.* But, beſide this unſuitableneſs to the context, the meaning expreſſed by ὁσοι προ εμε ηλθον appears exceptionable. Who were thoſe that came before him? Not Moſes and the Prophets, ſurely. For of theſe our Lord, far from calling them *thieves and robbers,* always ſpeaks honourably. Yet to theſe we ſhould otherwiſe moſt readily apply the expreſſion, eſpecially when we conſider that Jeſus ſtyles them to his diſciples, *the prophets who were before you.* 'The perſons here 'meant,' ſay ſome, 'are thoſe who, before his time, 'aſſumed the character of Meſſiah.' But who were theſe? It does not appear from any hiſtory, ſacred or profane, that any perſon, before his time, ever aſſumed the character or title of Meſſiah. Afterwards, indeed, agreeably to our Lord's prediction, it was aſſumed by many. Thendas and Judas of Galilee cannot be meant. They were rather contemporaries. And though both were ſeditious leaders, and gave themſelves out for extraordinary perſonages, we have no evidence that either of them pretended to be the Meſſiah. For all theſe reaſons, I think προ εμε ought to be rejected as an interpolation. The external evidence, or what I may call the teſtimonies in its favour, are at leaſt counterbalanced by thoſe againſt it; and the internal evidence ariſing from the ſenſe of the expreſſion, and the ſcope of the paſſage, is all on the contrary ſide. I read, therefore, with the Sy. the Vul. and, I may add, the old Italic, of which the Sax. is eſteemed by critics a literal tranſlation, παντες ὁσοι ηλθον. I conſider ηλθον as uſed here for εισηλθον, the ſimple for the compound uſed, verſe 1. and the word απλαχοθεν underſtood as ſupplied from that verſe. It is not unuſual, when there is occaſion for repeating a ſentiment, which has been advanced a little before, to abridge the expreſſion, on the ſuppoſition that what is wanting, the hearers will ſupply from memory. It will perhaps be objected to this explanation, that it makes this ſentence a mere repetition of what is ſaid in verſe 1ſt. I own that the affirmation in verſe 1ſt is here repeated, but not merely ſo, as it is attended with a very important explanation. The import of the two verſes, which will ſhow exactly their relation, may be thus expreſſed: 1. 'They who enter the fold otherwiſe than by the door, 'are thieves 'and robbers. 7. I am the door. 8. Conſequently 'they who enter otherwiſe than by me, are thieves and 'robbers.' This makes the eighth verſe, as it were, the concluſion of a ſyllogiſm, of which the firſt and the ſeventh are the premiſes. It is remarkable, that this has appeared to be the general import of the paſſage, even to thoſe interpreters who ſeem either not to have known how it could be deduced, or have attempted a method abſolutely indefenſible. Dr. Clarke (ſee his paraphraſe of verſe 8.) gives a ſenſe to the words which coincides with that here given; but he does not inform us how he makes it out, or in what manner he read the original. Elſner has endeavoured to draw the ſame meaning from the reading in the common Gr.; but, in my judgment, without ſucceſs. Ερχεσθαι προ θυρας for *to go paſt a door,* is, I ſuſpect, utterly unexampled. Beſides, who was ever accounted either thief or robber, for *going paſt the door,* if he did not attempt to break into the encloſure? But it may be ſaid, if the words προ εμε ought to be rejected, how ſhall we account for their introduction into ſo many copies? To this I can only reply, that the miſapprehenſion of the ſenſe, in ſome early tranſcriber, may not improbably have led him to take this method of ſupplying the ellipſis. It is in this manner that the greateſt freedoms which have been taken with the ſacred text are to be accounted for. Upon the whole, our Lord, when he compares himſelf to a ſhepherd, ſpeaks in the character of the great prophet or teacher of God's people; when he compares himſelf to the door of the ſheep-fold, he ſignifies that it is by him, that is, by ſharing in his grace, and partaking of his ſpirit, that the under-ſhepherds and teachers muſt be admited into his fold, that is, into his church or kingdom, and participate in all the ſpiritual bleſſings belonging to its members. In this view, the words are directed chiefly againſt the Scribes and Phariſees, conſidered as teachers, whoſe doctrine was far from breathing the ſame ſpirit with his, and whoſe chief object was, not like that of the good ſhepherd, to feed and to protect the flock, but, like that of the robber, or of the wolf, to devour them. I ſhall only add, before I conclude this note, that the interpretation here given ſuits the words that follow, as well as thoſe that precede. Thus, " 7. I am the door. 8. " All who enter in another manner are thieves and " robbers. 9. All who enter by me, ſhall be ſafe." How common was this method with our Lord, to

enforce his ſentiments by affirmations and negations thus connected?

14, 15. *I both know my own, and am known by them (even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father); and I give my life for the ſheep.* Ch. vi. 57. N. Diſſ. XII. P. IV. § 3.

16. *I have other ſheep beſides, which are not of this fold.* This is ſpoken of the Gentiles, who were afterwards to be received into his church on the ſame footing with the Jews.

18. *No one forceth it from me,* ουδεις αιρει αυτην απ' εμου. E. T. *No man taketh it from me.* This can hardly be ſaid with propriety, ſince he ſuffered by the hands of others. The Eng. verb *take*, does not expreſs the full import of the Gr. αιρεω. In this place, it is evidently our Lord's intention to inform his hearers, that his enemies could not, by violence, take his life, if he did not voluntarily put himſelf in their power.

22. *The feaſt of the dedication,* τα εγκαινια. It might be rendered more literally, *the feaſt of the renovation.* But the other name has obtained the ſanction of uſe. This feſtival was inſtituted by Judas Maccabæus, 1 Mac. iv. 59. in memory of their pulling down the altar of burnt offerings, which had been profaned by the Pagans, and building a new one, dedicated to the true God.

23. *It being winter,* χειμων ην. This feſtival began on the twenty-fifth of the month *Caſleu*, and was kept for eight days. It fell about the middle of our *December*.

25. *I ſaid to you, but ye believed not, "the works which "I do in my father's name, teſtify of me,"* ειπον υμιν και ου πιστευετε· τα εργα α εγω ποιω εν τω ονοματι του πατρος μου, ταυτα μαρτυρει περι εμου. E. T. *I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my father's name, they bear witneſs of me.* The words are capable of being rendered either way; but there is this difference: rendered in the one way, they are conformable to fact, as appears from this very Goſpel—"I ſaid to you, the works which I do," &c. That he had ſaid this, we learn from ch. v. 36. In the other way rendered, the words "I told you," can refer only to what they aſked him to tell them, to wit, whether he were the Meſſiah or not. Now, it does not appear, either from this or from any other Goſpel, that he had ever told them this in expreſs terms, as they wanted him to do. It may be proper to obſerve, that the Vul. is here, in reſpect of the ſenſe agreeable to the verſion I have given; but, in reſpect of the expreſſion, plainly points out a different reading. *Loquor vobis, et non creditis, opera quæ ego facio in nomine patris mei, hæc teſtimonium perhibent de me.* In conformity to this, the Cam. MS. alone, reads λαλω for ειπον.

26, 27. *Ye believe not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep. My ſheep, as I told you, obey my voice.* υ πιστευετε· υ γαρ εστε εκ των προβατων των εμων, καθως ειπον υμιν. Τα προβατα τα εμα της φωνης μου ακουει. E. T. *Ye believe not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep, as I ſaid unto you. My ſheep hear my voice.* This caſe is ſimilar to the former: καθως ειπον υμιν is joined, by our tranſlators, to the preceding words; I join them to thoſe which follow. My reaſon is the ſame as in the foregoing inſtance. The words which precede, had not, as far as we are informed, been expreſsly uſed by our Lord; the ſubſequent words had. On the common Gr. there is no change made but in the pointing. Indeed, the clauſe καθως ειπον υμιν, which has occaſioned the queſtion, is wanting in ſeveral MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. verſions. To recur to the authority of later interpreters and critics, would, in ſo plain a caſe, be quite unneceſſary.

29. *My Father, who gave them me, is greater than all,* ο πατηρ μου ος δεδωκε μοι μειζων παντων εστι. Vul. *Pater meus, quod dedit mihi, majus omnibus eſt.* There is nothing in the Gr. MSS. which can confer the ſmalleſt probability on this verſion of the La. interpreter. Two or three MSS. have ο for ος. The Al. reads μειζον for μειζων. The Cop. and Sax verſions agree with the Vul.

30. *I and the father are one,* εγω και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν. The word is not εις, *one perſon*, but εν, *one thing*, or the ſame thing. It might have been ſo rendered here; but the expreſſion is too homely, in the opinion of ſome excellent critics, to ſuit the dignity of the ſubject. The greater part of foreign interpreters have thought otherwiſe. Vul. Er. Zu. Caſ. Be. *Ego et pater unum ſumus.* Lu. Ich und der vater ſind eins. Dio. *Io e il padre ſiamo una iſteſſa coſa.* L. Cl. *Mon pere et moi ſommes une ſeule choſe.* P. R. Si. and Sa. *Une meme choſe.* What is diſtinguiſhed in the original, we ought, if poſſible, to diſtinguiſh. Yet no Eng. tranſlator known to me has, in this, choſen to deſert the common tranſlation.

34. *Is it not written in your law?* Here we find the book of Pſalms, whence the paſſage quoted is taken, included under the name *law*, which is ſometimes uſed for the whole Scriptures of the O. T.

35. *To whom the word of God was addreſſed,* προς ους ο λογος του Θεου εγενετο. It has been obſerved juſtly, that the words may be rendered, *againſt whom the word of God was pointed.* What gives countenance to this interpretation, is, that God, in the place quoted (Pſ. lxxxii. 6.), is ſeverely rebuking and threatening wicked judges and magiſtrates. On the whole, however, I prefer the verſion here given.

35. *And if the language of Scripture is unexceptionable—* και υ δυναται λυθηναι η γραφη.—E. T. *And the Scripture cannot be broken.* I do not know a meaning which, by any of the received laws of interpretation, we can affix to this expreſſion, *Scripture cannot be broken.* Yet it is impoſſible for one who attends to our Lord's argument, as it runs in the original, to entertain a doubt about

about the import of the clauſe which anſwers to it in the Gr. Our Lord defends what he had ſaid from the charge of blaſphemy, by ſhowing its conformity to the ſtyle of Scripture in leſs urgent caſes: inſomuch that, if the propriety of Scripture language be admitted, the propriety of his muſt be admitted alſo. This is one of thoſe inſtances wherein, though it is very eaſy for the tranſlator to diſcover the meaning, it is very difficult to expreſs it in words which ſhall appear to correſpond to thoſe of his author. In ſuch caſes, a little of circumlocution has always been allowed.

36. *Whom the Father hath conſecrated his Apoſtle to the world,* ον ὁ πατηρ ἡγιασε και απεστειλεν εις τον κοσμον. E. T. *Whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the world.* That ἁγιαζειν, in Scripture, often denotes *to conſecrate,* to ſet apart to any religious or important purpoſe, has been ſhown, Diſſ. VI. P. IV. § 9—13. It is evident, that it is only in this ſenſe applicable here. There are two words which Jeſus chiefly uſes for expreſſing his miſſion. One is, πεμπω, the other αποστελλω; the former a more familiar, the latter a more ſolemn, term. It is from the latter that the name *Apoſtle* is derived. Our Lord, in my opinion, has often an alluſion to this title, when it does not appear in the E. T. becauſe both words are promiſcuouſly rendered *ſend.* And though here the word *ſend* does but feebly expreſs the import of the original; for it may be ſaid of every man, that God hath *ſent* him into the world; I do not deny that, in moſt caſes, both words are properly ſo rendered, and that the purport of the ſentence is juſtly conveyed. In a few caſes, however, where there ſeems to be an alluſion to the title αποστολοι, by which he had diſtinguiſhed the twelve, it may be allowed to change the term for the ſake of preſerving the alluſion. Thus, ch. xvii. 18. when our Lord, in an addreſs to God, repreſents the miſſion of his Apoſtles by him, as analogous to that which he had himſelf received from his heavenly Father, he uſes theſe emphatical words: καθως εμε απεστειλας εις τον κοσμον, καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον. I have, for the ſake of exhibiting the analogy with like energy, rendered the words in this manner: *as thou haſt made me thy Apoſtle to the world, I have made them my Apoſtles to the world.* Jeſus is accordingly called, Heb. iii. 1. *the Apoſtle and High Prieſt of our profeſſion.* He is the Apoſtle of God; they were the Apoſtles of Chriſt. Hence appears more ſtrongly the propriety of what he ſaid, L. x. 16.: *He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me; and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.* Thus making them, in reſpect of their miſſion as teachers, ſtand in the ſame relation to him, in which he, as Heaven's interpreter, ſtood to God. In like manner, in the verſe under examination, as the word ἡγιασε evidently means *conſecrated,* or ſet apart for a ſacred office, ἡγιασε και απεστειλεν is, by a common idiom, uſed for ἡγιασε τε αποστελλεσθαι; or, which is the ſame, ἡγιασεν ειναι αποστολον.

37. *For calling himſelf his ſon,* ὁτι ειπον, υιος του Θεου ειμι. E. T. *Becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God.* Let it be obſerved, that our Lord's word here is υιος, not ὁ υιος. It is not, therefore, ſo definite as the common verſion makes it. At the ſame time, the want of the article in Gr. (as I have elſewhere obſerved) does not render the words ſo expreſsly indefinite, as, in our language, the indefinite article would render them, if the expreſſion were tranſlated *a Son of God.* For the ſake, therefore, of avoiding an error on either ſide, I have choſen this oblique manner of expreſſing the ſentiment. Mt. xxvii. 54. N.

39. *They attempted again*—εζητουν παλιν—. The Vul. has no word anſwering to παλιν, which is alſo omitted by the Cam. and a few other MSS.

CHAP. XI.

4. *Will not prove fatal,* ουκ εστι προς θανατον. E. T. *Is not unto death.* That the former way of rendering gives the full import of the Gr. expreſſion, as uſed here, cannot be queſtioned. It, at the ſame time, preſerves the ambiguity.

10. *Becauſe there is no light,* ὁτι το φως ουκ εστιν εν αυτω. E. T. *Becauſe there is no light in him.* Knatchbull has very properly obſerved, that the pronoun αυτω, here, manifeſtly refers to the noun κοσμω, in the end of the preceding verſe; and ſhould, therefore, be rendered *in it.* Common ſenſe, as well as the rules of conſtruction, require this interpretation. His ſtumbling in the night, is occaſioned by the want of that which prevents his ſtumbling in the day. *In it,* however, is better omitted in Eng. where it would encumber, rather than enlighten, the expreſſion, of itſelf ſufficiently clear.

25. *I am the reſurrection and the life;* that is, 'I am 'the author of the reſurrection and of the life'—a very common trope in Scripture of the effect for the efficient. In this way, God is called *our ſalvation,* to denote *our Saviour;* and Jeſus Chriſt is ſaid, 1 Cor. i. 30. to be made of God unto us, *wiſdom,* and *righteouſneſs,* and *ſanctification,* and *redemption*; that is, the ſource of theſe bleſſings.

27. *Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God, he who cometh into the world,* συ ει ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υιος του Θεου, ὁ εις τον κοσμον ερχομενος. E. T. *Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the world.* I have had occaſion to take notice (in another place, Diſſ. V. P. IV § 3—6. 14.) of the three titles juſt now mentioned, as different denominations or deſcriptions by which the ſame great perſonage was diſtinguiſhed. I have, therefore, kept them diſtinct. The two laſt are, as it were, compounded into one in the E. T. I have alſo obſerved, that the proper title is not *he who ſhould come,* but *he who cometh.* It was very natural in Mary, when profeſſing

profeſſing her faith in Jeſus, in conſequence of the queſtion ſo publicly put to her, to mention all the principal titles appropriated to him in Scripture.

37. *Who gave ſight to the blind man,* ὁ ανοιξας τας οφθαλμους τω τυφλω. Vul. *Qui aperuit oculos cæci nati.* E. T. *Which opened the eyes of the blind.* There is no Gr. MS. yet known which authoriſes the addition of *nati*, nor any verſion but the Cop. The ſingular number here employed by the Evangeliſt, ſhows a manifeſt alluſion to one idividual, Οι τυφλοι is properly *the blind.*

38. *Shut up with a ſtone,* λιθος επεκειτο επ' αυτω. E. T. *A ſtone lay upon it.* From the way in which the words are rendered in the Sy. verſion, and from a regard to a juſt remark of Si. that the prepoſition επι, in the Helleniſtic idiom, does not always imply *upon*, or *over*, I have been induced to render the expreſſion in the manner above mentioned; it being not improbable, that, in this reſpect, the ſepulchre was ſimilar to our Lord's.

39. *For this is the fourth day,* τεταρταιος γαρ εστι. E. T. *For he hath been dead four days.* It may mean, agreeably to verſe 17th, *he hath been buried four days.* The expreſſion is abrupt and elliptical; a manner extremely natural to thoſe in grief, and, therefore, worthy to be imitated, where it is poſſible, by a tranſlator.

41. *Then they removed the ſtone,* ηραν ουν τον λιθον, ου ην ο τεθνηκως κειμενος. The laſt clauſe, ου ην ο τεθνηκως κειμενος, is wanting altogether in the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. the Arm. the Eth. the Ara. and the Cop. verſions, as well as in ſome noted MSS. The words, ο τεθνηκως κειμενος, are wanting in the Go. and the ſecond Sy. verſions, and in the Al. MS. which reads ου η after λιθον. Nonnus omits the clauſe entirely. It is rejected by Origen, Mill, and Bengelius; and plainly adds nothing to the ſenſe.

49. *Caiaphas, who was high prieſt that year.* L. iii. 2. N.

2. *Ye are utterly at a loſs,* υμεις ουκ οιδατε ουδεν. E. T. *Ye know nothing at all.* It is manifeſt, from the whole ſcope of the paſſage, that it is not with the ignorance of the ſubject about which they were deliberating, the doctrine and miracles of our Lord, nor with the ignorance of the law for the puniſhment of offenders of all denominations, that Caiphas here upbraids them. Accordingly, we do not find, in what he ſays, any thing tending to give the ſmalleſt information on either of theſe heads. Yet ſomething of this kind is what occurs as the meaning, on firſt reading the words in moſt tranſlations. But what he upbraids them with here, is plainly the want of political wiſdom. They were in perplexity; they knew not what to reſolve upon, or what meaſure to adopt, in a caſe which, as he pretended, was extremely clear. It would appear, that ſome of the ſanhedrim were ſenſible that Jeſus had given them no juſt or legal handle, by any thing he either did or taught, for taking away his life; and that, in their deliberations on the ſubject, ſomething had been advanced, which made the high prieſt fear they would not enter with ſpirit and reſolution into the buſineſs. He, therefore, ſeems here concede to thoſe who appeared to have ſcruples, that, though their putting Jeſus to death could not be vindicated by ſtrict law or juſtice, it might be vindicated from expediency and reaſon of ſtate, or, rather, from the great law of neceſſity, the danger being no leſs than the deſtruction of their country, and ſo imminent, that even the murder of an innocent man, admitting Jeſus to be innocent, was not to be conſidered as an evil, but rather as a ſacrifice, every way proper for the ſafety of the nation. May we not reaſonably conjecture, that ſuch a manner of arguing muſt have ariſen from objections made by Nicodemus, who, as we learn from ch. vii. 50, &c. was not afraid to object to them the illegality of their proceedings, or by Joſeph of Arimathea, who was alſo one of them, and concerning whom we have this honourable teſtimony, L. xxiii. 50, 51. that he did not concur in their reſolutions.

56. *What think ye? Will he not come to the feſtival?* Τι δοκει υμιν, οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην; E. T. *What, think ye that he will not come to the feaſt?* This looks as if they knew, or took for granted, that he would not come, and were enquiring only about the reaſon of his not coming. This is not the meaning of the Evangeliſt, whoſe words, in the judgment of the beſt critics, make properly two queſtions, and ought to be pointed thus—Τι δοκει υμιν;—οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην;

CHAP. XII.

7. *Let her alone. She hath reſerved this*—Αφες αυτην ——τετηρηκεν αυτο. Five MSS. read ινα τηρηση. The Vul. in conformity to this, *Sinite illam ut ſervet illud.* With this, agree alſo, the Sax. Cop. and Eth. verſions, and paraphraſe of Nonnus. But when the common reading makes a clear ſenſe, which ſuits the context, the authorities juſt now mentioned are by no means a ſufficient reaſon for changing.

2. *To embalm me.* Ch. xix. 40. N.

10. *Determined,* εβουλευσαντο. E. T. *Conſulted.* I agree entirely with Gro. who obſerves, on this place, "βουλευεσθαι non eſt hic conſultare, ſed conſtituere, "ut Act. v. 33. xv. 37. 2 Cor. i. 17." It is tranſlated by Beau. *avoient reſolu*, which is literally rendered by the Eng. An. *had reſolved.* Indeed, ſuch a deſign on the life of a man whom they do not ſeem to have charged with any guilt, might appear improbable; but the maxim of Caiaphas above explained, ch. xi. 49. 2. N. would ſerve, with judges diſpoſed as thoſe prieſts then were, to juſtify this murder alſo.

11. *Many Jews forſook them, and believed on Jeſus,* πολλοι υπηγον των Ιυδαιων και επιστευον εις τον Ιησυν. E. T. *Many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jeſus.* This interpretation is rather feeble. The Eng. word *went,* and even the words *went away,* before the mention of ſomething done, are often little more than expletives. Here the word υπηγον bears a very important ſenſe, and denotes their ceaſing to pay that regard to the teaching of the ſcribes which they had formerly done. This is univerſally acknowledged to be the meaning of the verb in this paſſage. Biſhop Pearce, however, has gone too far in the oppoſite extreme from our tranſlators, where he ſays, *withdrew themſelves,* i. e. from the "public ſervice in the ſyna-"gogues." The ideas formed from the practice of modern ſectaries, have led him, in this inſtance, into a miſtake. No ſect of the Jews withdrew from the ſynagogue. Jeſus, far from withdrawing, or encouraging his diſciples to withdraw, attended the ſervice in the temple at Jeruſalem, and in the ſynagogue, wherever he happened to be. He promoted the ſame diſpoſition in his diſciples, by precept, as well as by example, and particularly warned them againſt diſregarding the miniſtry, on account of the vices of the miniſter. Mt. xxiii. 1, &c. The ſame conduct was obſerved by his Apoſtles and diſciples after him. He foretold them, that they would be expelled the ſynagogue, ch. xvi. 2. but never gave them permiſſion to leave it, whilſt they were allowed by the Jewiſh rulers to attend it. The book of Acts ſhows, that they did in fact attend the ſynagogue every Sabbath, where there was a ſynagogue to which they had acceſs. Diſſ. IX. P. IV. § 6.

13. *Iſrael's King.* Though we find, in the common copies, ὁ βασιλευς τυ Ισραηλ, the article ὁ is wanting in ſo great a number of MSS. and editions, as to give juſt ground for rejecting it. For which reaſon, though the difference is of little moment, I have made uſe of this expreſſion. Ch. x. 36. N.

16. *After Jeſus was glorified;* that is, after his reſurrection and aſcenſion.

17. *That he called Lazarus*—ὁτι τον Λαζαρον εφωνησεν—. Vul. *Quando Lazarum vocavit.* So many MSS. read ὁτε for ὁτι, and ſo many verſions are conformable to this reading, that it is hardly poſſible to decide between them. The ſenſe is good and appoſite either way. But, in ſuch caſes, it is better to let things remain as they are.

19. *Ye have no influence,* ὐκ ωφελειτε ὐδεν. Vul. *Nihil proficimus,* from the reading ωφελημεν, which has hardly any ſupport from MSS. or verſions.

26. *If any man ſerve me, my Father will reward him,* εαν τις εμοι διακονη, τιμησει αυτον ὁ πατηρ. E. T. *If any man ſerve me, him will my Fother honour.* The word τιμη, in Scripture, ſignifies not only *honour,* but *reward,* price, wages. The verb τιμαω admits the ſame latitude of ſignification. Beau. though he renders the word, in his verſion, in the common way, *le honorera,* ſays, in his note upon it, "autrement *le recompenſera.*" Nay, he adds in effect, that it ought to be thus rendered here, as it is oppoſed to *ſerving.* "Comme "*honorer* eſt ici oppoſé a *ſervir,* il ſignifie proprement "*recompenſer,* ainſi qu'en pluſieurs autres endroits de "l'ecriture."

27. *What ſhall I ſay? [Shall I ſay] Father, ſave me from this hour? But I came on purpoſe for this hour*—Τι ειπω; πατερ σωσον με εκ της ὡρας ταυτης, αλλα δια τυτο ηλθον εις την ὡραν ταυτην. E. T. *What ſhall I ſay? Father, ſave me from this hour: but for this cauſe came I unto this hour.* I underſtand the queſtion here, as ending, not at ειπω, but at ταυτης, at which there ſhould be a point of interrogation; or, rather, that the words ſhould be conſidered as two queſtions, in the manner done in this verſion. A ſimilar example we have in the preceding chapter, verſe 56th; for, in both, a part of the firſt queſtion is underſtood as repeated. There, τι δοκει ὑμιν; δοκει ὁτι ὁ μη ελθη——; Here, τι ειπω; ειπω, πατερ σωσον με——; I do not approve, with Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures), that τι ſhould be rendered *whether,* and the queſtion made, "Whether ſhall I ſay, Father, ſave me?——or, "Father, glorify thy name?" If theſe could be ſuppoſed to occur to the mind at once, there could not be a moment's heſitation about the preference. It ſuits much better the diſtreſs of his ſoul to ſuggeſt, at firſt, a petition for deliverance. But in this he is inſtantly checked by the reflection on the end of his coming. This determines him to cry out, "Father, glorify thy "name." This is not put as a queſtion. It is what his mind finally and fully acquieſces in.

32. *All men*—παντας—. Vul. *Omnia*—. Agreeably to this, the Go. and Sax. verſions tranſlate. The Cam. and one other MS. read παντα.

34. *From the law;* that is, from the Scriptures. Ch. x. 34. N.

36. *He withdrew himſelf privately from them,* απελθων εκρυβη απ' αυτων. E. T. *Departed, and did hide himſelf from them.* This, in my apprehenſion, conveys a ſenſe different from that of the original, which denotes ſimply, that, in retiring, he took care not to be obſerved by them. The Sy. verſion is very cloſe, and appears to me to imply no more. The Vul. which ſays, *abiit et abſcondit ſe ab eis,* ſeems to have miſled moſt of the modern interpreters. Caſ. has hit the meaning better. *Diſceſſit et eis ſeſe ſubduxit.*

40. *Blunted their underſtanding,* επωρωσεν αυτων την καρδιαν. Diſſ. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

42. *Several,* πολλοι. E. T. *Many.* The Gr. word is of greater latitude than the Eng. and anſwers more

exactly to the Fr. *plusieurs*, which, by translators from that language, is sometimes rendered *many*, sometimes *several*, as suits best the subject. Here, as it is only the minority of those in the highest offices that are spoken of, a minority greatly outnumbered by the opposite party, they can hardly be supposed very numerous.

44. *He who believeth on me, it is not on me he believeth*; that is, *not only on me*. The expression is similar to that in Mr. ix. 37. *Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me*. Both are explained in the same manner.

47. *But do not observe them*, και μη πιστευση. A considerable number of MSS. amongst which are the Al. and the Cam. read φυλαξη; to which agree, not only the Vul. which says, *et non custodierit*, but both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Eth. Ara. and Sax. versions, together with the paraphrase of Nonnus:

Και μη ασυλητοιο νομ σφηγιδα φυλαξη.

49. *What I should enjoin, and what I should teach*, τι ειπω και τι λαλησω. E. T. *What I should say, and what I should speak*. These phrases convey to us no conceivable difference of meaning. If no difference of signification had been intended by the words of the original, the τι would not have been repeated before the second verb. The repetition evidently implies, that the subject of the one is not the subject of the other. Ειπειν frequently means *to command*, to enjoin, and λαλειν *to teach*, to instruct by discourse. When these are thus conjoined, as things related, but not synonymous, they serve to ascertain the meaning of each other.

CHAP. XIII.

2. *While they were at supper*, δειπνου γινομενου. E. T. *Supper being ended*. Vul. Er. Zu. *Cœna facta*. Be. *Peracta*. Cas. *Parata*. The two first ways of rendering the words into La. express too much; the last, too little. That supper was *ended*, is inconsistent with what follows in the chapter; and if it was only *prepared*, it would not have been said, verse 4th, *he arose from supper*. Maldonat's solution hardly requires refutation. He affirms, that our Lord that night ate three suppers with his disciples; the paschal supper, their ordinary supper, and the eucharistical supper; if this last might be called a supper. Hence, we find them still eating together, after we had been told, that *supper was ended*. In defence of the way wherein the words are rendered in the Vul. he argues thus: the Evangelist says, not δειπνου γινομενου, *cum cœna fieret*, using the present participle, but γενομενου, *cum cœna jam facta esset*, using the participle of the aorist. To this, it sufficeth to reply, that the sacred writers use the participle γενομενος indiscriminately, for both purposes, but much oftener to express the present, or rather the imperfect, than the past. Thus, when γενομενης is joined with πρωιας, οψιας, ἡμερας, or any term denoting a precise portion of time, it invariably signifies that the period denoted by the noun was begun, not ended. Mr. says, vi. 2. γενομενου σαββατου ἠρξατο εν τη συναγωγη διδασκειν. I should be glad to know of a single interpreter who renders these words—*When sabbath was ended, he taught in the synagogue*. The words *sabbato facto*, in the Vul. denote no more here, in the judgment of all expositors, than *when Sabbath was come*. Our Lord says, Mt. xiii. 21. γενομενης θλιψεως δια τον λογον, ευθυς σκανδαλιζεται. Is it whilst the persecution rages, or when it is over, that men are tempted by it to apostatize? I shall add but one other example, from Mt. xxvi. 6, &c. Ιησου γενομενου εν βηθανια εν οικια Σιμωνος προσηλθεν αυτω γυνη. κ. τ. ἑ. Was it after Jesus had been in Simon's house in Bethany, that the woman anointed him with the precious balsam, or when he was there? The Vul. says expressly, *cum Jesus esset in domo Simonis*. I should not have brought so many examples in so clear a case, were it not to demonstrate, what even critics can forget, how unsafe it is to depend on general rules, without recurring to use, wherever the recourse is practicable.

4. *Mantle*, ἱματια. E. T. *Garments*. Ἱματιον properly signifies *the upper garment, the mantle*; and ἱματια, *garments*, or *clothes* in general. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 1, 2, 3. Yet the plural is sometimes used for the singular, and means no more but *mantle*, as Mt. xxiv. 18. xxvi. 65. xxvii. 35. ch. xix. 23.

10. *He who hath been bathing, needeth only to wash his feet*, ὁ λελουμενος ουκ χρειαν εχει ει μη τους ποδας νιψασθαι. For the distinction between λουειν and νιπτεσθαι, see ch. ix. 7. N. This illustration is borrowed from the custom of the times; according to which, those who had been invited to a feast, bathed themselves before they went; but, as they walked commonly in sandals, and wore no stockings, it was usual to get their feet washed by the servants of the family, before they laid themselves on the couches. Their feet, which would be soiled by walking, required cleaning, though the rest of their body did not. The great utility, and frequent need, of washing the feet in those countries, has occasioned its being so often mentioned in the N. T. as an evidence of humility, hospitality, and brotherly love.

13. *Ye call me The teacher and The master*, Υμεις φωνειτε με Ὁ διδασκαλος και Ὁ κυριος. E. T. *Ye call me master and lord*. The article in Gr. prefixed to each appellation, and the nominative case employed where, in common language, it would have been the accusative, give great energy to the expression, and show, that the words are applied to Jesus in a sense entirely peculiar. This is not at all expressed by the words, *ye call me master and lord*, as though it had been φωνειτε με διδασκαλον και κυριον; for so common civility might have led them to call fifty others. But the titles here given, can belong only to one. This remark extends equally to the following verse. For the import of the titles, see Diss. VII.

23. *Was*

23. *Was lying close to his breast.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—6.

33. *My children,* τεκνια. E. T. *Little children.* Diminutives answer a double purpose. They express either the *littleness* or *fewness*, in respect of size or number, of that to which they are applied, or the *affection* of the speaker. Diss. XII. P. I. § 19. There can be no doubt, that it is for the last of these purposes that the diminutive is used here. In Gr. when the first is only, or chiefly, intended, the word answering to little children is παιδια, or παιδαρια, not τεκνια. With us, the possessive pronoun answers better the purpose of expressing tenderness, for we have few diminutives.

34. *A new commandment.* In popular language, to which the manner of the sacred writers is very much adapted, that may be called a new law which revives an old law that had been in a manner abrogated by universal disuse. Our Lord, by this, warns his disciples against taking for their model, any example of affection wherewith the age could furnish them; or, indeed, any example less than the love which he all along, especially in his death, manifested for them.

CHAP. XIV.

1. *Believe on God, and believe on me,* πιστευετε εις τον Θεον, και εις εμε πιστευετε. E. T. *Ye believe on God, believe also in me.* The Gr. expression is ambiguous, and capable of being rendered different ways. The Vul. which has had great influence on the translators in the West, has preferred the latter method, *creditis in Deum et in me credite;* and, in respect of the sense, is followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. The Sy. has, on the contrary, preferred the former, which seems to be more generally adopted in the East. It was so understood also by Nonnus, who thus expresses the sense: Αλλα θεω και εμοι πιστευσατε. This is the sense which the Gr. commentators also put upon the words; and, in this way, Luther interprets them. They are so rendered into Eng. by Dod. Wes. and Wor. The reasons of the preference I have given to this manner, are the following: 1st, In a point which depends entirely on the Gr. idiom, great deference is due to the judgment of those whose native language was Gr. The consent of Gr. commentators, in a question of this kind, is, therefore, of great weight. 2dly, The two clauses are so similarly expressed and linked together by the copulative, that it is, I suspect, unprecedented to make the verb, in one an indicative, and the same verb, repeated in the other, an imperative. The simple and natural way is, to render similarly what is similarly expressed; nor ought this rule ever to be departed from, unless something absurd or incongruous should follow from the observance of it. This is so far from being the case here, that I remark, 3dly, That, by rendering both in the imperative, the sense is not only good, but apposite. How frequently, in the book of Psalms, are the people of God, in the time of affliction, exhorted to trust in the Lord? Such exhortations, therefore, are not understood to imply a total want of faith in those to whom they are given.

2. *I go to prepare a place for you,* πορευομαι ετοιμασαι τοπον υμιν. Vul. *Quia vado parare vobis locum.* The Al. Cam. and several other MSS. do, in like manner, introduce the clause with ὁτι. The Arm. version also agrees with the Vul. Nonnus likewises uses this conjunction—ὁτι προκαλευθος ὁδευσω. But the evidence in favour of the common reading greatly preponderates.

11. *Believe,* πιστευετε μοι. Vul. *Non creditis.* This interpretation has doubtless arisen from a different reading. For the negative particle, there is no testimony in confirmation of the Vul. except the Sax. version. The Sy. has not read μοι, nor is it necessary to the sense. I have expressed the import of this pronoun in interpreting the next clause—ει δε μη, *if not on my testimony.*

12, 13. *Nay, even greater than these he shall do, because I go to my Father, and will do whatsoever ye shall ask in my name*—και μειζονα τουτων ποιησει· ὁτι εγω προς τον πατερα μου πορευομαι. και ὁ, τι αν αιτησητε εν τω ονοματι μου, τουτο ποιησω. E. T. *And greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do.* This rendering is deficient both in perspicuity and in connection. Yet, except in the pointing, I have made no change on the words of the Evangelist. Our Lord's going to his Father, considered by itself, does not account for their doing greater works than he had done; but when that is considered, along with what immediately follows, that he will then do for them whatever they shall ask, it accounts for it entirely. When the 12th verse is made, as in the Eng. translation, a separate sentence, there is little connection, as well as light, in the whole passage. The propriety of reading the words in the manner I have done, has been justly observed by Gro. and others.

13, 14. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son, whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do*—ινα δοξασθη ὁ πατηρ εν τω υιω. εαν τι αιτησητε εν τω ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω. E. T. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.* The latter part of the 13th verse, I have detached from the preceding sentence, and joined into one sentence with the 14th verse. This preserves better the simplicity of construction in the sacred writings, and accounts for the repetition in verse 14th, of what had been said immediately before, almost in the same words.

14. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do,* εαν τι αιτησητε εν τω ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω. Vul. *Si quid*

quid petieritis me in nomine meo hoc faciam. The blunder in tranſcribing ſeems here pretty evident; yet it has the ſupport of a few MSS. not of principal account, and of the Go. and Sax. verſions.

16. *Monitor*, παρακλητον. E. T. *Comforter*. In the interpretation of this word, critics have been much divided. It is uſed by no other ſacred writer; neither does it occur in the Sep. John uſes it four times in his Goſpel, all in reference to the ſame perſon, and once in his firſt Epiſtle, as ſhall be obſerved immediately. The Sy. Vul. and ſome other ancient verſions, retain the original term. Moſt modern interpreters have thought it better to tranſlate it. Er. ſometimes retains the word, and ſometimes renders it *conſolator*; ſo does alſo Leo de Juda. Caſ. ſays *confirmator*, Be. *advocatus*. Under the firſt or laſt of theſe, all the tranſlations into European tongues with which I am acquainted, may be ranged. Lu. Dio. G. F. Beau. P. R. Sa. and all the late Eng. verſions but one, follow Er. The An. follows Be. L. Cl. though he does not render the word *avocat*, but *defenſeur*, may be added; as he ſhows, in the notes, that he means by *defenſeur*, what other interpreters meant by *avocat*; and for the ſame reaſon Si. who alſo renders the word *avocat*. Ham. has well obſerved on the paſſage, that the word is ſuſceptible of theſe three ſignifications *advocate*, *exhorter*, and *comforter*. If, inſtead of *exhorter*, he had ſaid *monitor*, I ſhould readily admit that theſe three terms comprehend all that is ever implied in the original word. But the word *exhorter* is of very limited import, barely denoting one who by argument incites another to perform ſomething to which he is reluctant; for *exhortation* always preſuppoſes ſome degree of *reluctance* in the perſon *exhorted*, without which it would be unneceſſary. The term *monitor* includes what is moſt eſſential in the import of *exhorter*, as well as that of *remembrancer* and *inſtructor*, and comes nearer in extent than any one word, in our language, to the original term. I own that the word in claſſical authors more commonly anſwers to the La. *advocatus*. But the Eng. word *advocate* is more confined, and means one who, in the abſence of his client, is inſtructed to plead his cauſe before his judge, and to defend him againſt his accuſer. In this ſenſe our Lord is called παρακλητος, 1. J. ii. 1. which is in the E. T. properly rendered *advocate*. *If any man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous.* We have one who, in our abſence, appears for us, and defends our cauſe before our judge. The notion of an *advocate* brings along with it the notion of a *judge* who is to paſs ſentence, and of a *client* who is to be defended. But if any regard is due to the ſcope of the place, the word *advocate* is very improperly introduced in the paſſage under examination, where there is nothing which ſuggeſts the idea of judge, cauſe, or party. *The advocate* exerciſes his office in preſence of *the judge*. Whether *the client* be there or not, is of no conſequence, as he is repreſented by his *advocate*. Now this παρακλητος, who, we are told, verſe 26th, is *The Holy Spirit*, was to be ſent to the diſciples of Jeſus, to remain with them for ever. If the word here then denote *advocate*, and if the Holy Spirit be that *advocate*, are the diſciples, to whom he is ſent, *the judges?* what is the cauſe to be pleaded, and who are the parties? This interpretation introduces nothing but confuſion and darkneſs. The only plea in its favour, which has any thing ſpecious in it, is that, by the wiſdom and eloquence with which the Spirit endowed the Apoſtles, and firſt Chriſtian preachers, he powerfully defended the cauſe of Chriſt before the world: but as thoſe firſt teachers themſelves were made the inſtruments or immediate agents of the victory obtained to the Chriſtian cauſe, over the infidelity of both Jews and Pagans, the Holy Spirit was to them much more properly a *monitor* or *prompter*, than an *advocate*. He did not appear openly to the world, which, as our Lord ſaith, 17. *neither ſeeth him nor knoweth him*; but, by his ſecret inſtructions, they were qualified to plead with ſucceſs the cauſe of Chriſtianity. Let it be obſerved further, that our Lord ſays, that when he himſelf is gone, his Father will ſend them *another* παρακλητος, who will remain with them for ever. From this we learn, 1ſt, That our Lord himſelf, when he was with them, had diſcharged that office among them; and, 2dly, That it was to ſupply his place in the diſcharge of the ſame function, that the Holy Spirit was to be ſent. Now when our Lord is ſaid, ſince his aſcenſion into heaven, to be our *advocate* and *interceſſor* with the Father, we perceive the beauty and energy, as well as the propriety of the repreſentation. But we ſhould never think of the title *advocate* for expreſſing the functions he diſcharged to his diſciples when he ſojourned among them upon the earth. We ſhould readily ſay that to them he acted the part of a tutor, a father, a monitor, a guide, a comforter; but nobody would ſay that he acted to them as an advocate. I have been the more particular here for the ſake of ſhowing that it is not without reaſon, that Be. has in this been ſo generally deſerted, even by thoſe Proteſtant interpreters who, on other occaſions, have paid but too implicit a deference to his judgment. Is *comforter* then the proper term? *Comforter*, I admit, is preferable. But this appellation is far from reaching the import of the original. Our Saviour, when there was occaſion, as at this time in particular, acted the part of a *comforter* to his diſciples. But this part is, in its nature, merely occaſional, for a time of affliction; whereas that of *monitor*, *inſtructor*, or *guide*, is, to imperfect creatures like us, always needful and important. Were we, in one word, to expreſs the part acted by our Lord to his followers, we ſhould certainly adopt any of the three laſt expreſſions rather than the firſt. Or if we conſider what is here aſcribed to the Spirit as the part he is to act among the diſciples, it will lead us to the ſame interpretation. *The Holy Spirit*, ſays our Lord, verſe 26. *whom the Father will ſend in my name; he will teach you all things, and remind you of all that I have told you.* Is not this to ſay, in other words, "He will be to you a faithful monitor?" Further,

the conjugates of the word παρακλητος entirely ſuit this interpretation. The general import of παρακαλειν, in the active voice, is *to admoniſh*, to exhort, to entreat, and παρακλησις, *admonition*, exhortation. It is manifeſt, as has been juſtly remarked by Dr. Ham. that in ſome places the import of the noun has been unduly limited, by being rendered *comfort* or conſolation; particularly that παρακλησις του αγιου πνευματος, Acts, ix. 31. is much more properly rendered *the admonition*, than *the comfort of the Holy Spirit*. Diſſ. VIII. P. III. § 8.

18. *I will not leave you orphans*, ουκ αφησω υμας ορφανους. E. T. *I will not leave you comfortleſs*. I cannot imagine what could have led our tranſlators into the ſingularity of deſerting the common road, where it is ſo patent; unleſs, by introducing *comfortleſs*, they have thought that they gave ſome ſupport to their rendering the word παρακλητος in the context, *comforter*.

19. *Becauſe I ſhall live*; that is, return to life. A great part of this diſcourſe muſt have been dark at the time it was ſpoken; but the event explained it afterwards.

22. *Wherefore wilt thou diſcover thyſelf to us? τι γεγονεν οτι ημιν μελλεις εμφανιζειν σεαυτον*. E. T. *How is it that thou wilt manifeſt thyſelf unto us?* The expreſſion *How is it that*, is ambiguous, and may be an inquiry about the manner of his diſcovering himſelf to them. The words of the Evangeliſt can be interpreted only as an inquiry into the reaſon of his diſcovering himſelf to them, and not to the world. This queſtion aroſe from the remains of national prejudices in regard to the Meſſiah, to which the Apoſtles themſelves were never entirely ſuperior, till after the deſcent of the Holy Spirit related in the 2d ch. of The Acts. Our Lord's anſwer in the two following verſes, though in all probability, not perfectly underſtood by them at the time, aſſigns a reaſon for the diſtinction he would make between his diſciples and the world, but ſays nothing about the manner of diſcovering himſelf.

24. *Is not mine, but the Father's*; that is (ſetting aſide the idiom), is not ſo much mine as the Father's. Mt. ix. 13. Mr. ix. 37.

28. *Ye would rejoice that I go to the Father, εχαιρετε αν οτι ειπον, πορευομαι προς τον πατερα*. E. T. *Ye would rejoice, becauſe I ſaid, I go unto the Father*. The word ειπον is not in the Al. MS. nor in the Cam. It is wanting alſo in ſeveral others. There is nothing which anſwers to it in either of the Sy. verſions, or in the Vul. Goth. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. or Ara. Origen. Cyril, Chr. ſeem not to have read it. The ſame may be affirmed of Nonnus the Paraphraſt. Such a concurrence of all the moſt ancient and moſt eminent tranſlations, ſupported by ſome of the beſt MSS. and Grecian critics, have induced me to join with Mill and Bengelius in rejecting it.

30. *The prince of the world, ο του κοσμου τουτου αρχων*. E. T. *The prince of this world*. There is ſuch a powerful concurrence of MSS. both thoſe of principal note and others, with both the Sy. verſions, ſome of the moſt celebrated Gr. commentators, together with Nonnus, in rejecting the pronoun τουτου, that not only Mill, But Wet. who is much more ſcrupulous, is for excluding it.

30. *He will find nothing in me, ουκ ευρισκει εν εμοι ουδεν*. E. T. *Hath nothing in me*. Though not ſo great as in either of the inſtances immediately preceding, there is conſiderable authority from MSS. verſions, and ancient authors, for reading either ευρησει or ευρησει, inſtead of ουκ εχει. For this reaſon, and becauſe it makes the expreſſion clearer, without altering the ſenſe, I think, with Mill, it ought to be admitted.

CHAP. XV.

2. *He cleaneth by pruning, καθαιρει* E. T. *He purgeth*. Critics have obſerved a verbal alluſion or paronomaſia in this verſe. To the barren branch the word αιρει is applied; to the fruitful καθαιρει. It is not always poſſible in a verſion, to preſerve figures which depend entirely on the ſound, or on the etymology of the words, though ſometimes they are not without emphaſis. This verſe, and the following, afford another, and more remarkable, inſtance of the ſame trope. As our Lord himſelf is here repreſented by the vine; his diſciples are repreſented by the branches. The mention of the method which the dreſſer takes with the fruitful branches, in order to render them more fruitful, and which he expreſſes by the word καθαιρει, leads him to take notice of the ſtate wherein the Apoſtles, the principal branches, were at that time, Ηδη υμεις καθαροι εστε. It is hardly poſſible not to conſider the καθαιρει applied to the branches as giving occaſion to this remark, which immediately follows it. Now, when the train of the thoughts ariſes in any degree from verbal alluſions, it is of ſome conſequence to preſerve them, where it can be eaſily effected, in a tranſlation. It is for this reaſon that I have tranſlated the word καθαιρει by a circumlocution, and ſaid *cleaneth by pruning*. It is evident that καθαιρει, in this application, means *pruneth*. But to have ſaid in Eng. ſimply *pruneth*, would have been to throw away the alluſion, and make the thoughts appear more abrupt in the verſion than they do in the original; and to have ſaid *cleaneth*, without adding any explanation, would have been obſcure, or rather improper. The word uſed in the E. T. does not preſerve the alluſion, and is, beſides, in this application, antiquated. Nonnus appears to have been careful to preſerve the trope: for though almoſt all the other words in the two verſes are changed, for the ſake of the meaſure, he has retained καθαιρειν and καθαροι. Few tranſlators appear to have attended to this alluſion: yet whatever ſtrengthens the aſſociation in the ſentences, ſerves to make them both better underſtood, and longer remembered.

6. *Like the branch which is withered,* ὡς το κλημα και εξηρανθη. E. T. *As a branch, and is withered.* The laſt clauſe is rather indiſtinct. Knatchbull's obſervation on the place is very juſt. In the idiom of the ſacred writers, the copulative often ſupplies the place of the relative. A remarkable example he has given from the Sep. Ruth. i. 11. It is an Heb. idiom, of which many examples might be brought from the O. T. as well as ſome from the New. This ſuperſedes entirely Biſhop Pearce's conjectural correction of the text.

10. *Ye ſhall continue in my love,* μεινατε εν τη αγαπη μου. Dod. and Wor. *Ye will continue in my love.* The precept *continue in my love,* in the preceding verſe, which muſt determine the meaning of this declaration, is capable of being underſtood in two ways, as denoting either *continue to love me,* or *continue to be loved by me;* in other words, 'keep your place in my affection.' In my opinion the latter is the ſenſe, and therefore I have retained the old manner *ye ſhall* in preference to *ye will,* as the former is frequently the ſign of a promiſe, which I take the ſentence to contain to this effect: *If ye keep my commandments, ye ſhall continue the objects of my love.* For this preference, it is proper to aſſign my reaſons: Firſt, it is moſt natural to ſuppoſe, that when our Lord enjoined them to continue in a particular ſtate, it would be in that ſtate wherein he had ſignified that they then were. Now this ſtate, is manifeſtly that of being loved by him; of which mention is made in the words immediately preceding. *As the Father hath loved me,* ſays he, *ſo have I loved you; continue in my love.* 'Ye 'poſſeſs my love at preſent, continue to poſſeſs it.' But here a doubt might ariſe in their minds, 'How ſhall 'we continue to poſſeſs it? or how ſhall we know that 'we continue to poſſeſs it?' To obviate all ſuch exceptions, he adds, 'If ye keep my commandments, 'ye ſhall continue to poſſeſs my love; as I have kept 'my Father's commandments, and continue to poſſeſs 'his love.' In the other way explained, beſides that the connection is looſe, the paſſage is not ſo ſignificant. 'If ye keep my commandments, ye will continue to 'love me.' Better, one would think, 'If ye continue 'to love me, ye will keep my commandments;' ſince that is regarded as the cauſe, this as the effect. Accordingly a good deal is ſaid to this purpoſe afterwards.

11. *That I may continue to have joy in you,* ινα η χαρα η εμη εν υμιν μεινη. E. T. *That my joy might remain in you.* It is to be obſerved, that εν υμιν is placed betwixt η χαρα η εμη, and μεινη. I render it as immediately connected with the words preceding, our tranſlators have rendered it as belonging to the word which follows. The former makes a clear and appoſite ſenſe, the latter is obſcure, not to ſay myſterious.

16. *It is not you,* ουχ υμεις. Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 32.

That the Father may give you whatſoever ye ſhall aſk him in my name, ινα ο τι αν αιτησητε τον πατερα εν τω ονοματι μου, δω υμιν. It is an obvious remark, that δω is equivocal, as it applies equally to the firſt perſon, and to the third. Explained in the firſt perſon, it runs thus: *that I may give you whatſoever ye ſhall aſk the Father in my name.* Nonnus explains the words ſo in his Paraphraſe; but the Vul. the Sy. and indeed the whole current of interpreters, have underſtood the verb as in the third perſon. This interpretation is alſo beſt ſuited to the ſcope of the place. I have, therefore, with the other Eng. tranſlators, adopted it here.

18. *It hated me before it hated you,* εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν. Vul. *Me priorem vobis odio habuit.* The other La. interpreters, if not in the ſame words, are to the ſame purpoſe. So are alſo the Sy. and other Oriental tranſlations. The M. G. and all the other verſions I know, before the preſent century, expreſs the ſame ſenſe. Nonnus has ſo underſtood the words, who ſays πρωτον εμε συγγεγακε. For, as he has not prefixed the article, and has ſuppreſſed the pronoun, his words cannot be otherwiſe rendered than *it hated me firſt.* Unleſs my memory fails me, I may affirm the ſame thing of ancient commentators as of interpreters. This uniformity of interpretation, where the ſubject is nowiſe abſtruſe, is a ſtrong preſumption in its favour. Our Lord was not diſcuſſing any ſublime queſtion of theology, but giving plain admonitions to patience and conſtancy, which, it would be ſtrange to imagine, had been ſo expreſſed by the Evangeliſt, as to be univerſally miſunderſtood by thoſe expoſitors who ſpoke the ſame language, who lived, I may ſay, in the neighbourhood, not long after thoſe events; and to be at laſt diſcovered in the eighteenth century, by thoſe who, comparatively, are ſtrangers both to the dialect, and to the manners, of the age and country. Yet Dr. Lardner, a very reſpectable name, I acknowledge, is the firſt who has defended a different meaning, a meaning which had indeed been hinted, but not adopted, by Be. more than a century before. Lardner ſuppoſes πρωτον here to be neither adjective nor adverb, but a ſubſtantive, of which the proper interpretation is *prince* or *chief.* It is freely owned that the ſenſe which reſults from this rendering is both good and appoſite, yet not more ſo than the common verſion. Nothing ſerves more ſtrongly to fortify the ſoul with patience under affliction, than the remembrance of what thoſe whom we eſteem, underwent before us. Πρωτος, as was formerly obſerved, (ch. i. 15. 30 N.) is often uſed ſubſtantively for *chief;* that is, firſt, not in time, but in excellence, rank, or dignity. Some examples of this uſe were given. But it ought to be remembered, that πρωτος, in this application, when it has a regimen, preſerves the conſtruction of an adjective in the ſuperlative degree. It is commonly preceded by the article, and is always followed, either by the genitive plural of the noun expreſſing the ſubject of compariſon, or, if the noun be a collective, by the genitive ſingular. In like manner, the noun governed includes both the thing compared, and the

the things to which it is compared. Thus, to say ὁ πρωτος εστιν ὑμων, *he is the chief of you*, implies he is one of you; οἱ πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας can be applied to none but Galileans, and οἱ πρωτοι των Ιυδαιων, to none but Jews. He who is called (Acts, xxviii. 7.) ὁ πρωτος της νησου, must have been one of the islanders. If, then, our Lord had said εμε τον πρωτον ὑμων μεμισηκεν, I should admit the interpretation to be plausible, as the construction is regular, and he himself is included in the ὑμων; but the words which the Evangelist represents him as having used, no more express this in Gr. than the words *Jesus was the greatest of the apostles*, would express in Eng. that he was no apostle, but the Lord and Master of the apostles. When Paul calls himself (1 Tim. i. 15.) πρωτος ἁμαρτωλων, *chief of sinners*, is he not understood by every body as calling himself a sinner? *The chief of the Levites* (Num. iii. 32.) was certainly a Levite, and *the chief of the singers* (Neh. xii. 46.) was a singer. But are there no exceptions from this rule? I acknowledge that there is hardly a rule in grammar which is not, through negligence, sometimes transgressed, even by good writers: and if any think that such oversights are to be deemed exceptions, I will not dispute about the word. Only in regard to such exceptions, it will be admitted a good rule for the expounder, never to suppose a violation of syntax, when the words, construed in a different manner, appear regular, and yield an apposite meaning. This I take to be the case in the present instance. That there are examples of such inaccuracy in the use of superlatives, perhaps in all languages, can hardly be denied. Of this I take that quoted from 2 Mac. vii. 41. to be a flagrant example; εσχατη των υἱων ἡ μητηρ ετελευτησε, which is literally, *the mother died last of the sons*. This is of a piece with that of our poet:

> Adam the comeliest man of men since born
> His sons, the fairest of her daughters Eve.

For my part, I think it much better, in criticizing, to acknowledge these to be slips in writing, than to account for them by such supposed enallages, and unnatural ellipses as totally subvert the authority of syntax, and leave every thing in language vague and indeterminate. The ellipses of a preposition suggested in the present case is merely hypothetical; for no examples are produced to show, either that πρωτος has the meaning ascribed to it, when accompanied with any of the prepositions εξ, προ, περι, or επι, supposed to have been dropped; or that it has the meaning without a preposition, when the supposed ellipsis takes place. Yet both of these, especially the latter, appear to be necessary for removing doubt. The only thing that looks like an example of the superlative πρωτος, with an exclusive regimen, is that expression Mt. xxvi. 17. τη πρωτη των αζυμων, spoken of the day of the passover, which was the fourteenth of the month; though, in strictness, the fifteenth was the first of the days of unleavened bread. But for this Dr. Lardner himself has sufficiently accounted, by showing that these two successive festivals, though distinct in themselves, are often, in the Jewish idiom, confounded as one, and that both by the sacred writers and by the historian Josephus. Let it be further observed, that in none of the three places where the phrase in question occurs (to wit, ch. i. 15. 30. and here) is πρωτος accompanied with the article which, for the most part, attends the superlative, especially when used for a title of distinction, and more especially still when, as in this place, the article is necessary to remove ambiguity; for πρωτον without it, is more properly an adverb, or adverbial preposition, than a noun. Add to all this, that πρωτος is not a title which we find anywhere else in the N. T. either assumed by our Lord, or given to him. This title is indeed in one place (Mt. x. 2.) given to Peter as first of the apostles. Of the propriety of this application there can be no doubt. The attentive reader will observe that the objections here offered against Lardner's interpretation of the clause under review, equally affect his interpretation of the clause πρωτος με ην, ch. i. 15. 30.

20. *If they have observed my word, they will also observe yours*, ει τον λογον με τηρησαν, και τον ὑμετερον τηρησουσιν. E. T. *If they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.* Several critics are of opinion, that the word τηρειν is used here in a bad sense for, to watch with an insidious design. But I do not find that the simple verb τηρειν ever occurs in this sense in Scripture, though the compound παρατηρειν is so used by both Mr. and Lu. It is also worthy of notice that the phrase τηρειν τον λογον, seems to be a favourite expression of the Evangelist John, and is everywhere else manifestly employed in a good sense; so that if this be an exception, it is the only one. What has been now remarked, makes much more in favour of the common translation, than what has been observed of the words immediately following in verse 21. which imply that all the treatment mentioned had been bad, makes against it: for let it be observed, that the connection is often founded, not on the form of the expression, but on what is suggested by it. Our Lord, by what he here says, recalls to their memories the neglect and contempt with which his doctrine had been treated, and in allusion to which he says, *All this treatment*, &c. I shall only add, that even admitting that there is some ambiguity in the Gr. verb τηρειν, it will not surely be thought greater than there is in the Eng. word *observe*, employed in this translation, and sometimes susceptible of an unfavourable meaning.

24. *But now they have seen them, and yet hated both me and my Father*, νυν δε και εωρακασι, και μεμισηκασι, και εμε και τον πατερα μου. E. T. *But now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.* In order to give consistency to the argument which our Lord here uses, we are obliged to consider αυτα as understood after εωρακασι. All the foreign translations I have seen, whether from the Gr. or from the La. supply the pronoun

noun in this place. Without it, the words convey a very different ſenſe; a ſenſe which is neither ſo appoſite, nor ſo intelligible.

CHAP. XVI.

2. *Nay the time is coming when*—αλλ' ερχεται ωρα ινα. E. T. *Yea the time cometh that*—Biſhop Pearce would have us read αλλ' ερχεται ωρα in a parentheſis, and connect ινα with the words which precede, becauſe he thinks that to render ινα *when* is ſcarcely to be juſtified. But he has not deviſed any correction, or taken any notice of verſe 32. of the ſame chapter, where the like phraſe occurs, ερχεται ωρα και νυν εληλυθεν, ινα σκορπισθητε, and where the ινα, to the conviction of all expoſitors, denotes *when*. This is a plain Hebraiſm; their caſual conjunction ב *chi*, being ſometimes uſed in this ſenſe; an idiom more frequent in J. than in any other penman of the N. T. We have another example of it from him, if I miſtake not, in his third Epiſtle, verſe 4th.

2. *Will think he offereth ſacrifice to God*, δοξη λατρειαν προσφερειν τω Θεω. E. T. *Will think he doth God ſervice.* Our tranſlators have here followed the Vul. which has *arbitretur obſequium ſe præſtare Deo.* Er. Zu. Caſ. and Be. have done better in ſubſtituting *cultum* for *obſequium.* The La. word *obſequium*, and the Eng. word *ſervice*, are too general: λατρεια is properly the public ſervice of religion, and when joined, as in this place, with προσφερειν, can mean only *ſacrifice.* It is ſo rendered in the Sy. verſion and the Go. Some adages of their rabbies regarding the aſſaſſination of the enemies of their religion, ſhow how juſtly they are here repreſented by our Lord.

3. *Theſe things they will do*, ταυτα ποιησουσιν υμιν. E. T. *Theſe things they will do unto you.* But υμιν is wanting in many MSS. of principal note, as well as in others of leſs conſideration, in the Com. and in that of Ben. in the firſt Sy. verſion, the Go. the Sax. and the Ara.; alſo in ſome La. MSS. In the 2d Sy. verſion, it is marked with an aſteriſk, as of doubtful authority at the beſt. It ſeems not to have been admitted by Chr. Cyril, The. or Cyprian. For theſe reaſons I agree with Mill and Wet. in rejecting it.

9. *Concerning ſin*; that is, *their ſin* in rejecting me, whereof the Spirit will give inconteſtible evidence in the miracles which he will enable my Apoſtles to perform in my name, and the ſucceſs with which he will crown their teaching.

10. *Concerning righteouſneſs*; that is, *my righteouſneſs* or innocence, the juſtice of my cauſe (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.), of which the ſame miraculous power exerted for me by my diſciples, will be an irrefragable proof, convincing all the impartial, that I had the ſanction of Heaven for what I did and taught, and that, in removing me hence, God hath taken me to himſelf.

11. *Concerning judgment*; that is, *divine judgment*, ſoon to be manifeſted in the puniſhment of an incredulous nation, and in defence of the truth.

16. *Within a little while.* Diſſ. XII. P. I. § 24.

25. *In figures*, εν παροιμιαις. E. T. *In proverbs.* Vul. *In proverbiis.* Er. and Zu. *Per proverbia.* Be. *Per ſimilitudines.* Caſ. *Oratione figurata.* Παροιμια is uſed by the Seventy in tranſlating the Heb. משל *maſhal*, which ſignifies not only a proverb, but whatever is expreſſed in figurative or poetical language, as their proverbs commonly were. Thus it is uſed, ch. x. 6. for a ſimilitude, rendered in the E. T. *a parable.* Here it is manifeſtly uſed in all the latitude, implied in the expreſſion employed by Caſtalio; that is, for figurative language, not intended to be underſtood by every body, and perhaps, for a time, not perfectly even by the Apoſtles themſelves.

30. *That any ſhould put queſtions to thee*, ινα τις σε ερωτα. E. T. *That any man ſhould aſk thee.* There are two Gr. verbs not ſynonymous, uſed in this context αιτειν and ερωταω, which are both rendered in the E. T. *aſk.* The former anſwers always to the Eng. word, when it means *to beg*, to entreat; the latter generally, but not always, when it denotes *to put a queſtion.* As the Eng. verb *aſk*, had been uſed in the former ſenſe in verſe 26. anſwering to αιτειν, I thought it better here to uſe a periphraſis, than to employ the ſame word for expreſſing the latter ſenſe, in rendering the verb ερωταω. Even the ſlighteſt appearance of ambiguity ſhould be avoided in the tranſlation, when there can be no doubt concerning the meaning of the original. The purport of their words, therefore, in this place, is, 'Thou knoweſt 'us ſo perfectly, and what all our doubts and difficulties are, as renders it unneceſſary to apply to 'thee by queſtions. Our intentions this way are 'anticipated by the inſtructions which thou art giving 'us from time to time.'

CHAP. XVII.

3. *Thy apoſtle*, ch. x. 36. N.

5. *Father, glorify thou me in thine own preſence*, δοξασον με συ, πατερ, παρα σεαυτω. E. T. *O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf.* This expreſſion, though apparently more literal, is remarkably obſcure. The force of the Gr. prepoſition παρα, is not rightly expreſſed by the Eng, *with*, which, as applied here, is exceedingly vague and indeterminate.

11. *Preſerve them in thy name*, τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου. E. T. *Keep through thine own name thoſe*—. It muſt be acknowledged that there is ſome difficulty in the words εν τω ονοματι σω, which I have rendered literally *in thy name.* *Name* is uſed in Scripture ſometimes

times for *perſon*, Rev. iii. 4.; ſometimes for *fame*, Pſ. lxxvi. 1.; and ſometimes, when applied to God, for his *power*, or other perfections, Pſ. xx. 1. 7. When mention is made of *making known God's name* to the heathen, we always underſtand it to mean, declaring to them his nature and attributes, as the only true God. It is ſolely *to the heathen*, or thoſe who before knew not God, that, in the O. T. we find mention of revealing his name. But let it be obſerved, that they were Jews of whom our Lord ſpoke, verſe 6th, when he ſaid, *I have made known thy name to the men whom thou haſt given me.* The ſequel ſhows, that he meant the Apoſtles, who, before they became his diſciples, were the diſciples of Moſes. Now, by making known the name of God to thoſe who enjoyed the old diſpenſation, is plainly ſuggeſted, that additional light was conveyed to them, which they could not have derived from it. By manifeſting God's name to them, therefore, we muſt underſtand the communication of thoſe truths which peculiarly characteriſe the new diſpenſation. And as every revelation which God gives, tends further to illuſtrate the divine character, the inſtructions which our Lord gave to his diſciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of ſinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which, in the Heb. idiom, is the ſame) *the name of God* to them. When the connection in this prayer is conſidered with any degree of attention, we muſt be ſenſible that the words, *the name of God*, in verſes 6th, 11th, 12th, and 26th, denote the ſame thing. If, then, by *the name of God*, verſes 6th and 26th, be meant the great foundations of the Chriſtian inſtitution, the being preſerved or kept in it, verſes 11th and 12th, muſt mean their being enabled to continue in the faith and practice of that religion. Our tranſlators, by rendering ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου differently, in verſes 11th and 12th, have darkened the expreſſion, and led the generality of readers into miſtakes. *Keep, through thine own name*, can hardly be underſtood otherwiſe than as ſignifying, preſerve, by thy power. Similar expreſſions occur in the Pſalms and other places. If verſe 11th were the only place in this prayer where mention is made of *the name of God*, I ſhould not deny that that interpretation would have ſome plauſibility. But, as that is not the caſe, we cannot interpret ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου one way in verſe 11th, and another way in verſe 12th, where it is ſimilarly connected and conſtrued. What is to be remarked in the ſubſequent note, ſerves, in ſome degree, to confirm the interpretation now given. I own the Eng. word *name* hardly admits the latitude of acceptation. But it was obſerved (Diſſ. XII. P. V. § 12.), that we are obliged ſometimes, in order to avoid tireſome circumlocutions, to admit an application of particular terms, which is not entirely warranted by uſe. When there is a difficulty (for it is only of ſuch caſes I am ſpeaking), there is this advantage in tracing the words of the original, that the ſenſe of the ſacred writer is not arbitrarily confined by the opinions of the tranſlator, but is left in the text, as nearly as poſſible, in the ſame extent, to the judgment of the reader.

11. *Which thou haſt given me*, ὃς δέδωκάς μοι. E. T. *Whom thou haſt given me.* But there is a great majority of MSS. and, among them, thoſe of principal conſideration, which reject the word ὃς in this place. A few ſubſtitute ὁ in its room, but the much greater number have ὦ. In either way, the meaning is the ſame with that given in this verſion. The relative in Gr. often takes the caſe of the antecedent, and not always, as in La. the caſe that is governed by the verb with which it is connected. For reading ὦ, there is alſo the authority of the Com. both the Sy. tranſlations, and the Ara. Of the fathers, there are Athanaſius, Cyril, The. and Euth.; likewiſe many modern critics; amongſt whom are, Ham. Mill, and Wet. Add to this, that ſuch a miſtake as the change of ὦ into ὃς, in this place, is eaſily accounted for: ὃς δέδωκάς μοι occurs in the very next verſe. It is incident to tranſcribers, either through inadvertency in directing their eye, or through ſuſpicion of miſtake in the former copier, to make the expreſſions of the author, which are nearly the ſame, entirely ſo. Beſides, the meaning of ὃς δέδωκάς is more obvious than that of ὦ δέδωκας, which might readily lead a tranſcriber to conſider the latter as a mere blunder in copying. But if the word was originally ὃς, it is not eaſily to be accounted for, that it ſhould have been ſo generally corrected into ὦ, and the like correction on verſes 6th and 12th not attempted. It may be obſerved in paſſing, that this reading does not a little confirm the ſenſe I have given to the word *name*, through the whole of this paſſage. If, by the name here be meant the Goſpel revelation, nothing can be more conformable to the tenor of our Lord's whole diſcourſe on this occaſion; this revelation was given by the Father to the Son, to be by him communicated to the world.

11. *That they may be one, as we are*, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς. The word is here ἓν, *one thing*; not εἷς, *one perſon*. Ch. x. 30. N.

13. *That their joy in me may be complete*, ἵνα ἔχωσι τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς. E. T. *That they might have my joy fulfilled in themſelves.* What meaning our tranſlators affixed to theſe words, I cannot ſay; but the whole ſcope and connection make it evident, that ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ denotes, here, not the joy which I have (the only ſenſe which the words *my joy* will bear in Eng.), but the joy whereof I am the object, the joy they will derive from me. Beau. ſeems to have been the firſt modern interpreter who rendered the words intelligibly, *afin qu'ils goutent en moi une joie parfaite*; and the only one in Eng. the An.

17. *By the truth*, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου. E. T. *Through thy truth.* The pronoun is not in ſome principal MSS. nor in the Vul. the Go. and the Sax. verſions. Cyril ſeems not to have read it; and Ben. and Mill reject it. It is very unneceſſary here, as the explanation

ſubjoined, *thy word is the truth*, ſufficiently appropriates it.

24. *Father, I would* πατερ, θελω. E. T. *Father, I will.* Θελω expreſſes no more than a petition, a requeſt. It was ſpoken by our Lord in prayer to his heavenly Father, to whom he was obedient, even unto death. But the words *I will*, in Eng. when *will* is not the ſign of the future, expreſs rather a command. The La. *volo*, though not ſo uniformly as the Eng. *I will*, admits the ſame interpretation; and, therefore, Beza's manner here, who renders the word uſed by John, *velim*, is much preferable to that of the Vul. Er. Zu. and Caſ. who ſay, *volo*. That the ſenſe of the Gr. word is, in the N. T. as I have repreſented it, the critical reader may ſoon ſatisfy himſelf, by conſulting the following paſſages in the original: Mt. xii. 38. xxvi. 39. Mr. vi. 25. x. 35. In ſome of theſe, the verb is rendered *would*, by our tranſlators; it ought to have been rendered ſo in them all, as they all manifeſtly imply requeſt, not command. In moſt of the late Eng. tranſlations, this impropriety is corrected. Dod. and Weſ. have, indeed, retained the words *I will*; nay, more, have made them the foundation of an argument (one in his Paraphraſe, the other in his Notes), that what follows *I will*, is not ſo properly a petition, as a claim of right. But this argument is built on an Angliciſm in their tranſlations, for which the ſacred author is not accountable. Auguſtine, in like manner, founding on a Latiniſm, argued from the word *volo* of the Itc. verſion, as a proof of the equality of the Father and the Son. He is very well anſwered by Be. whoſe ſentiments on this ſubject are beyond ſuſpicion. See his Note on the place. The ſons of Zebedee alſo uſe the word θελομεν, Mr. x. 35. in making a requeſt to Jeſus; but it would be doing great injuſtice to the two diſciples, to ſay, either that they claimed, as their right, what they then aſked, or that they called themſelves equal to their lord and maſter. Calvin, ſpeaking of thoſe who, in ſupport of the trinity of perſons in the godhead, argued that Moſes, in his account of the creation, joins *elohim* (a word ſignifying God), in the plural number, to the verb *bara* (created), in the ſingular, adviſes very properly, "Monendi ſunt lectores ut ſibi a violentis ejuſ-"modi gloſſis caveant" (Comment. in Gen. i. 1.). I ſhall conclude this note with the words of Caſ. (Defenſio, &c.): "Ego veritatem velim veris argumentis "defendi, non ita ridiculis, quibus deridenda propinetur "adverſariis."

CHAP. XVIII.

1. *Over the brook Kidron,* περαν τυ χειμαρρυ των Κεδρων. E. T. *Over the brook Cedron.* The Al. MS. alone, reads τυ Κεδρων. The majority of modern critics agree with Jerom in thinking, that this, which ſuits the Vul. *trans torrentem Cedron*, is the genuine reading; a remarkable inſtance wherein the internal evidence is more than a counterbalance to numerous teſtimonies, or ſtrong external evidence on the oppoſite ſide. *Kidron* is, in Heb. the name of a brook near Jeruſalem, of which mention is ſeveral times made in the hiſtorical books of the O. T. The name, when written, in Gr. characters, coincides with the genitive plural of the appellative κεδρος, *a cedar*. The tranſcribers of the N. T. were (with very few, if any, exceptions) Greeks or Latins, who knew nothing of Heb. Such, finding the ſingular article τυ joined with the plural κεδρων, would naturally impute it to inadvertency, ariſing from hurry in tranſcribing. In conſequence of this notion, τυ would readly be changed into των, by all who choſe to have their copies clear from flagrant blunders. This ſo perfectly, and with ſo much natural probability, accounts for the change of τυ into των, both here, and in ſome places of the Sep. as, in my judgment, greatly preponderates all the MSS. and verſions in the oppoſite ſcale. Moſt interpreters ſince Jerom's time, that is, ſince the introduction of the ſtudy of Oriental literature into the Weſt, have thought ſo likewiſe. It may be remarked alſo, that this is one of the few paſſages in which the Eng. tranſlators have preferred the reading of the Vul. though unſupported, to the almoſt univerſal reading of the Gr. the proper verſion of which is, *the brook of Cedars*. My reaſon for ſaying *Kidron* and not *Cedron*, I have aſſigned above. Diſſ. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

11. *Put up the ſword,* βαλε την μαχαιραν συ. E. T. *Put up thy ſword.* But the pronoun is wanting in moſt of the MSS. of principal account, and a great many others. It is neither in the Com. edition, nor in that of Ben. It is not in either Sy. Go. Cop. or Arm. verſions. Nonnus, who ſays ſimply, κολεω τε τηθει ξιφος, ſeems not to have read it. Mill and Wet. reject it.

15. *And another diſciple,* και ὁ αλλος μαθητης. This is another inſtance wherein our tranſlators have preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The Vul. ſays, *et alius diſcipulus*. The only authorities from MSS. for this reading, are the Al. the Cam. and another of leſs note; all which omit the article. Wet. mentions no verſions which favour it, except the Vul. and the Go. It is ſurpriſing, that he does not mention the Sy. which expreſſes exactly the ſenſe of the Vul. in this manner, *and one of the other diſciples*. It was impoſſible, in that language, which has no articles, to ſhow more explicitly that, in their original, the expreſſion was indefinite. The Sax. verſion alſo ſays, *another*. This renders it very probable, that it was ſo in the old Itc. Nonnus too expreſſes it indefinitely, και τις αλλος εταιρος. On the whole, however, if it were not for that evidence which reſults from connection, the ſcope of the place, and the ordinary laws of compoſition, I ſhould not lay great ſtreſs on all that can be pleaded in its favour from poſitive teſtimony.

20. *Whither*

20. *Whither the Jews conſtantly reſort,* ὅπου πάντοθεν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέρχονται. This is the third example in this chapter (ſo many will not be found in all the reſt of the Goſpel) wherein our tranſlators, whom I have copied in theſe inſtances, have deſerted the common Gr. Here, however, they have adopted a reading vouched by the plurality of MSS. though unſupported either by the Vul. or by the Sy. Beſide MSS. the Com. and ſome other valuable editions, read πάντοτε. This reading is favoured alſo by the Go. and ſecond Sy. verſions, and by ſome of the Gr. fathers. Πάντες is ſupported by the Al. and ſeveral other MSS. ſome early editions, with the Vul. 1ſt Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Eth. verſions. Be. in his edition, whence the common editions are derived, has put πάντοθεν, giving his reaſon in the Notes, in theſe words: "in vetuſtis codicibus legimus πάντο-"τε: ego verò exiſtimo, vel legendum πάντες, vel πάν-"τοθεν, quod facile potuit a librariis mutari in πάν-"τοτε." Wet. after theſe words which he quotes, ſubjoins, very properly, "et ita quidem, quod mi-"reris, contra omnes codices edidit." I ſhall add, as what appears to me ſtill more ſurpriſing, that Beza's "ego verò exiſtimo," enforced merely by his own example, ſhould, with ſo many modern editors, and ſome tranſlators, prove more than a counterpoiſe to all the authorities of MSS. and verſions which can can be pleaded againſt it.

28. *To eat the paſſover.* Ch. xix. 14. N.

37. *Thou art king then?* Οὐκοῦν βασιλεύς εἶ σύ; E. T. *Art thou a king then?* As to the form of the interrogation, ſee the parallel paſſage in Mt.; as to the expreſſion βασιλεύς εἰ, though it be not ſo definite, and, conſequently, ſo emphatical, as if it had the article; it is not, on the other hand, ſo indefinite as it is in the E. T. by being rendered *a king.* This would never have been ſaid of one who claimed to be king of the country, which was, doubtleſs, Pilate's view of our Lord's pretenſions. The expreſſion, *a king*, on the contrary, ſuggeſts the notion of foreign dominions. The import of the original is ſufficiently expreſſed in our language, by the omiſſion of the definite article, a thing not uncommon in converſation; and the more natural here, as the words are a repetition of what had been expreſſed more fully, verſe 33. For I have had occaſion to obſerve before, that ſuch ellipſes are often adopted in repeating phraſes which have but very lately occurred. Ch. xix. 12. N.

40. *Then they all cried,* ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν πάντες. E. T. *Then cried they all again.* The word πάλιν is wanting in a conſiderable number of MSS. in the Com. edition, the Sy. Cop. Sax. Ara. Arm. and Eth. verſions. In many Lat. MSS. it is not found. Beſides, it does not ſuit the preceding part of our Lord's trial, as related by this Evangeliſt, who makes no mention of their crying in this manner before.

CHAP. XIX.

2. *A purple mantle,* ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν. It is called, Mt. xxvii. 28. *a ſcarlet cloak,* χλαμύδα κοκκίνην. The names denoting the colour of the garment, ought to be underſtood with all the latitude common in familiar converſation. This cloak, in ſtrictneſs, may have been neither purple nor ſcarlet, and yet have had ſo much of each, as would naturally lead one to give it one of theſe names, and another the other.

12. *Whoever calleth himſelf king,* πᾶς ὁ βασιλέα ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν. E. T. *Whoſoever maketh himſelf a king.* That the verb ποιεῖν here means no more than *to call*, is evident from verſe 7th. We have, in this verſe, an example of what was obſerved on ch. xviii. 37. The ſentence whereof theſe words are a part, is true, when βασιλεία is rendered *king*, but not when rendered *a king.* Judea, at that time, together with Syria, to which it was annexed, made a province of the empire. Nothing more certain, than that whoever, in Judea, called himſelf *king*, in the ſenſe wherein the word was commonly underſtood, oppoſed Ceſar. But it did not, therefore, hold, that whoſoever called himſelf *a king*, oppoſed Ceſar; for, if the kingdom to which he laid claim, was without the bounds of the Roman empire, the title no-wiſe interfered with the rights of the emperor. So much does the ſignificance of a ſentence ſometimes depend on what would be thought a very minute circumſtance.

14. *Now it was the preparation of the paſchal-ſabbath,* ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα. E. T. *And it was the preparation of the paſſover.* The word παρασκευὴ, in the N. T. denotes always, in my opinion, the day before the Sabbath, and not the day which preceded any other feſtival, unleſs that feſtival fell on the Sabbath. My reaſons for this opinion are as follows: 1ſt, The explanation now given, coincides exactly with the definition which Mr. gives of that word, ch. xv. 42. ἦν παρασκευὴ ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον. *It was the preparation, that is, the eve of the Sabbath.* 2dly, The word occurs ſix times in the N. T.; and, in all theſe places, confeſſedly means the ſixth day of the week, anſwering to our Friday, and, conſequently, the day before the Jewiſh Sabbath, or Saturday. 3dly, The preparation of all things neceſſary the day before the Sabbath, that they might be under no temptation to violate the ſabbatical reſt, was expreſsly commanded in the law. Ex. xvi. 5. 23. There was nothing analogous to this enjoined in preparation for the other feaſts. But it may be objected, that, in the paſſage under conſideration, the expreſſion is παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα. To this it has been anſwered, and I think juſtly, that the word πάσχα was not always confined to the ſacrifice of the lamb or kid, appointed to be on the fourteenth of the month Niſan, at even; but was often extended to the whole of the feſtival, which began with the paſchal ſacrifice, properly ſo called,

and

and continued the seven days of unleavened bread which immediately followed. The whole time is called indifferently, sometimes *the feast of the passover*, sometimes *the feast of unleavened bread*. In further confirmation of this, it has been observed, that other sacrifices offered during that period, were sometimes termed *the passover*. Deut. xvi. 2. it is said, *thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd*. Now, the last term, *the herd*, could only relate to the other sacrifices presented during the seven days which succeeded, and not to the signal commemorative sacrifice called, by way of eminence, *the passover*, with which the festival was introduced; for, as to it, it could be taken only from the flock. Nor does the argument rest on this single passage. In 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9. *bullocks* (which are there improperly rendered *oxen*) are mentioned as passover offerings, in the same way with *lambs* and *kids*. Now, if the whole period, and the sacrifices offered therein, were sometimes familiarly called the passover, it is extremely probable that the Sabbath of the passover-week should, in the same way, be distinguished from other Sabbaths, especially as it appears to have been considered by them as a day peculiarly memorable. Thus, verse 31st, the Evangelist tells us, that *that Sabbath* (he is speaking of the day after our Lord's crucifixion) *was a great day*. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, rendered the word πασχα here, *paschal-sabbath*. This serves also to account for what we are told, ch. xviii. 28. that the Jews *entered not the pretorium, lest they should be defiled, and so not in a condition to eat the passover*. If we suppose (and, in this supposition, there is surely nothing incongruous) that the Evangelist used the word in the same latitude that Moses and the writer of the Chronicles did, in the passages above quoted, the whole difficulty vanishes. No more is meant by *eating the passover*, than partaking in the sacrifices offered during the days of unleavened bread, which the rabbies have since distinguished by the name *chagiga*. Others have attempted to remove these difficulties by supposing that our Lord anticipated the legal time, that he might have an opportunity of eating the passover before his death; a thing extremely improbable in every view. It does not suit the circumstances of the story, as related by Mt. Mr. and L. (for, as to this, J. is silent), who all speak of it just as men would speak of a festival, celebrated at the known and stated time, and in the usual manner, and not as in a way singular and irregular. Further, there is no omission of duty in not celebrating an anniversary which one does not live to see; but, in anticipating the time, there would have been a real transgression of the commandment, which expressly confined the observance to the fourteenth day of the month, permitting no change of the day, except in a particular case of uncleanness, which is not pretended to have taken place here; and in which case the choice of another day is not left open, but the time is fixed to the fourteenth of the ensuing month. Add to this, that, in such an anticipation of the sacrifice, the concurrence of some of the priesthood would have been necessary (see 2. Chron. xxx. 16, 17. xxxv. 11.), which, we have reason to believe, could not have been obtained. To obviate these objections, distinctions have been devised, of which we find not a vestige in Scripture, or in the writings of the rabbies. Such is that of Gro. between the paschal-sacrifice and the paschal-commemoration. The latter, he supposes our Lord to have solemnized, but not the former. A manner of solving difficulties, so hypothetical and so fanciful, as it offers no evidence, needs no confutation. Those who chuse to see a fuller discussion of this matter, may consult Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. on Mr. xiv. 12. and J. xviii. 28. or Whitby's Appendix to the fourteenth chapter of Mr.

[2]. *About the sixth hour*, ὡρα δε ὡσει ἑκτη. As this does not perfectly accord with Mr. (xv. 25.), who says, *it was the third hour when they nailed him to the cross*, such an appearance of contradiction could not fail to be soon observed; and the observation has not failed of producing the usual effect—the correction of one Gospel by another. Accordingly, the Cam. MS. reads τριτη; but little regard is due to this, if Wetstein's remark be just, that that leaf is not written by the hand which wrote the rest of the MS. but appears, from the character, to be of a much later date. Certain it is, that, in the La. translation wherewith that copy is accompanied, the word is *sexta*. There are only three other MSS. of little account, which read τριτη. Nonnus also has read thus; but not one of the ancient translators. Eusebius, and, after him, other Gr. commentators, favour this reading. Dod. in his Paraphrase, adopts it, though he translates the words in the common way. He supports his opinion, in a note from a passage found in a fragment of Peter of Alexandria; concerning which, Wet. observes, that Petavius has shown that Peter was not the author. The common hypothesis is, that some early transcriber has mistaken the Γ, the numeral mark for 3, for the ϛ, the mark for 6; and thus has substituted ἑκτη instead of τριτη. Others suppose that J. speaks of the condemnation of Jesus, Mr. of the crucifixion; that J. reckons the hours as we do, and means 6 in the morning; Mr. speaks in the Jewish manner, and means 9; and that, consequently, three hours intervened between the sentence and the execution. Abstracting from other improbabilities in this account, it is manifest, from several places of this Gospel, ch. i. 39. iv. 6. 52. that J. like all the other Evangelists, reckoned the hours in the Jewish manner. For my part, I prefer the solution (though it may be accounted but an imperfect one) given by those who consider the day as divided into four parts, answering to the four watches of the night. These coincided with the hours of 3, 6, 9, and 12, or, in our way of reckoning, 9, 12, 3, and 6, which suited also the solemn times of sacrifice and prayer in the temple; that, in cases wherein they did not think it of consequence to ascertain the time with great accuracy, they did not regard the intermediate hours, but only those more noted divisions which happened to come nearest

the time of the event ſpoken of. Mr. ſays, ωρα δε ὡρα τριτη; from which we have reaſon to conclude, that *the third hour* was paſt. J. ſays, ὡρα ὡσει ἑκτη; from which I think it probable, that *the ſixth hour* was not yet come. On this ſuppoſition, though the Evangeliſts may, by a faſtidious reader, be accuſed of want of preciſion in regard to dates, they will not, by any judicious and candid critic, be charged with falſehood or miſrepreſentation. Who would accuſe two modern hiſtorians with contradicting each other, becauſe, in relating an event which had happened between 10 and 11 forenoon, one had ſaid it was paſt 9 o'clock; the other, it was drawing towards noon?

23. *His mantle*, τα ἱματια αυτου. Ch. xiii. 4. N.

25. *Mary, the wife of Cleophas*, Μαρια ἡ του κλωπα. The Ara. verſion renders it, *Mary, the daughter of Cleophas*. The original expreſſion is ſuſceptible of either interpretation. Mt. i. 6. N.

29. *Having faſtened it to a twig of hyſſop*, ὑσσωπῳ περιθεντες. There muſt have been ſome plant in Judea of the loweſt claſs of trees or ſhrubs, which was either a ſpecies of hyſſop, or had a ſtrong reſemblance to what the Greeks called ὑσσωπος; inaſmuch as the Helleniſt Jews always diſtinguiſhed it by that name. Indeed, the Gr. word, if we may judge from its affinity in ſound, is probably derived from the Heb. name אזוב, *ezob*. It is ſaid of Solomon, 1 Ki. iv. 33. that *he ſpake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyſſop that ſpringeth out of the wall*. Now, they did not reckon among trees any plants but ſuch as had durable and woody ſtalks. (See N. on Mt. vi. 30.) That their *hyſſop* was of this kind, is evident, alſo, from the uſes of ſprinkling; to which it is, in many caſes, appointed by the law to be applied.

30. *Yielded up his ſpirit*, παρεδωκε το πνευμα. Mt. xxvii. 30. N.

40. *Which is the Jewiſh manner of embalming*, καθως ἐθος ἐστι τοις Ἰουδαιοις ἐνταφιαζειν. E. T. *As the manner of the Jews is to bury*. But the proper meaning of the verb ἐνταφιαζειν is not *to bury*, but *to embalm*, or to prepare the body for burial—*pollincire, corpus ad ſepulturam componere*. The Vul. indeed, renders the clauſe, *ſicut mos eſt Judæis ſepelire*, which is the real ſource of the error in modern tranſlations. Suffice it to obſerve here, that the verb ἐνταφιαζειν, and the verbal noun ἐνταφιασμος, are uſed in the N. T. only in relation to the embalming of the body of our Lord. The word uſed for *to bury*, is invariably θαπτειν. The uſe followed by the Sep. is entirely ſimilar: ἐνταφιαζειν is *to prepare the corpſe*; θαπτειν is *to bury*. The import of both words, and, conſequently, the diſtinction between them, is exemplified, Gen. l. 2. 5. In verſe 2d, προσεταξεν Ἰωσηφ τοις παισιν αυτου τοις ἐνταφιασαις ἐνταφιασαι τον πατερα αυτου, και ἐνεταφιασαν οἱ ἐνταφιαζαι του Ἰσραηλ. E. T. *Joſeph commanded his ſervants, the phyſicians, to embalm his father; and the phyſicians embalmed Iſrael*. Whereas, in verſe 5th, Joſeph's words to Pharaoh are—Ὁ πατηρ μου ὡρκισε με, λεγων, Εν τῳ μνημειῳ ὁ ὡρυξα ἐμαυτῳ ἐν γῃ Χανααν, ἐκει με θαψεις. νυν οὐν ἀναβας, θαψω τον πατερα μου. E. T. *My father made me ſwear, ſaying, "In my grave which I have digged for "me in the land of Canaan, there ſhalt thou bury me." Now, therefore, let me go up, I pray thee, and bury my father*. Here the difference in meaning between the two verbs, is diſtinctly marked. The former, το ἐνταφιαζειν, was the work of *the phyſicians*, according to the import of the Heb. term, or of *the embalmers*, according to the Gr.; the latter, το θαπτειν, was the work of Joſeph, and the company who attended him: the former was executed in Egypt, the latter in Canaan. Let it be obſerved further, that the two Gr. words are the tranſlation of two Heb. words, which are never uſed promiſcuouſly, or miſtaken for each other. In this paſſage, which is the only place wherein the Seventy have uſed the verb ἐνταφιαζειν, the Vul. has carefully preſerved the diſtinction. It renders ἐνταφιαζειν, *aromatibus condire*, and θαπτειν, *ſepelire*. To a judicious Eng. reader, who conſiders the vaſt quantity of the moſt coſtly aromatics which, the Evangeliſt tells us, were beſtowed by Nicodemus on the body of our Lord, the clauſe ſubjoined, *as the manner of the Jews is to bury*, muſt have a very ſtrange appearance. The firſt reflection that would naturally ariſe in his mind would be, 'If 'ſo, ſurely not one of a hundred of the people could 'afford to be buried.' Yet certain it is, that no nation was more careful than the Jewiſh to bury their dead; though, very probably, not one of an hundred was embalmed. But it had been predicted of our Lord, not only that he ſhould be numbered with *tranſgreſſors* (malefactors), not only that his grave ſhould be appointed with the wicked (which was the caſe of thoſe who ſuffered, as criminals, by public juſtice. See Nicolai de Sepulchris Hebræorum, Lib. III. Cap. V.); but that he ſhould be joined with the rich in his death; circumſtances which, before they happened, it was very improbable, ſhould ever concur in the ſame perſon.——L. Cl. and Si. are the only French tranſlators who ſeem to have been ſenſible of the proper meaning of ἐνταφιαζειν. The former ſays *ſelon la coutume que les Juifs ont de preparer les corps pour les enſevelir*: the latter *comme le pratiquent les Juifs avant que d' enſevelir leurs morts*. The late Eng. tranſlations follow implicitly the common verſion.

CHAP. XX.

8. *Believed* [*the report*], ἐπιστευσε. E. T. *Believed*. It naturally occurs here to aſk what? The active verb *believe*, in our language, requires, in every caſe, where it is not manifeſt from the preceding words, the addition of the thing believed. Was this, in the preſent inſtance, our Lord's reſurrection? No: that had not yet been reported to him, or ſo much as inſinuated. Mary Magdalene had affirmed only that

the body had been carried off, and that she knew not where they had laid it. Besides, we learn, from what immediately follows, that our Lord's first appearance to her (and to her the Evangelist Mr. informs us, (xvi. 9.) that he appeared first of all) was after the two disciples had left the place. The ellipsis here, therefore, is most naturally supplied by the words *the report*, to wit, that made by Mary above recited, which had occasioned the visit made at that time to the sepulchre, by the two disciples. The Cam. MS. reads ουκ επιστευσεν. But in this that MS. is singular, not having the support of any MS. or version. Even the La. translation, with which it is acompanied, has no negative particle.

10. *To their companions*, προς ἑαυτους. E. T. *Unto their own home.* The words are capable of either interpretation; but I have, with Dod. adopted the former, as it suits better what is related both by this, and by the other Evangelists; from all of whom we learn that our Lord's disciples spent much of this day together.

17. *Lay not hands on me*, Μη μου ἁπτου. E. T. *Touch me not.* The verb ἁπτεσθαι in the use of the Seventy, denotes not only *to touch*, but *to lay hold on, to cleave to*, as in Job, xxxi. 7. Ezek. xli. 6. and other places. The sense here plainly is, 'Do not detain me at pre-'sent. The time is precious. Lose not a moment, 'therefore, in carrying the joyful tidings of my re-'surrection to my disciples.'

19. *Jesus came where the disciples were convened, the doors having been shut for fear of the Jews*, και των θυρων κεκλεισμενων, ὁπου ἡσαν οἱ μαθηται συνηγμενοι, δια τον φοβον των Ιουδαιων, ηλθεν ὁ Ιησους. E. T. *When the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus.* This arrangement does not well in English: if it do not suggest a false meaning, it at least renders the true meaning obscure. The disciples assembled, but surely not for fear of the Jews; for, as they did not intend by violence to oppose violence, if any should be offered them, they could not but know that to assemble themselves would more expose them to danger than any other measure they could take. The plain matter is; they assembled for mutual advice and comfort, and being assembled, the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, as they were well aware of the consequence of being discovered at such a time, in consultation together. On the other hand, the words do not necessarily imply, that, whilst the doors continued shut, our Lord entered miraculously. Κεκλεισμενων is even more literally rendered *having been shut*, than *being shut*, or *when they were shut*; as it is the preterperfect, not the present or imperfect participle. They may have been, therefore, for aught related by the Evangelist, made by miracle to fly open and give him access.

25. *Put my fingers into the print of the nails*, βαλω του δακτυλον μου εις τον τυπον των ηλων. Vul. *Mittam digitum meum in locum clavorum.* The Al. and four other MSS. have τοπον for τυπον. The Sy. as well as the Vul. and Sax. follows this reading. The sense is the same.

27. *Be not incredulous, but believe*, μη γινου απιστος αλλα πιστος. E. T. *Be not faithless, but believing.* The word *faithless* is here used in a sense in which it is now obsolete. Both the Gr. words πιστος and απιστος, in this passage, are to be understood as merely Hellenistical for *credens* and *non credens*, a sense in which they frequently occur in the N. T. See Acts, x. 45. xvi. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13, 14. 1 Tim. iv. 3. 10. 12. v. 16. vi. 2. In these commonly the meaning has been justly exhibited by interpreters. In rendering Gal. iii. 9. ὡστε οἱ εκ πιστεως ευλογουνται συν τω πιστω Αβρααμ, translators have been rather unlucky in an expression which, if not improper at the time, was, at least, equivocal, and darkened the sense. *So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* The connection here appears more in the sound than in the sense. Properly, *They, therefore, who believe, are blessed with Abraham who believed.*

CHAP. XXI.

7. *Girt on his upper garment*, τον επενδυτην διεζωσατο. E. T. *He girt his fisher's coat unto him.* Επενδυτης, agreeably to its etymology from επενδυω, *super induo*, signifies an upper garment. It occurs in no other place of the N. T.; but, from the use the Seventy have made of it in the Old, there is no reason to confine the meaning to the garb of any particular profession, or even to that of either sex. In one of the only two places wherein it occurs in the Sep. (1 Sam. xviii. 4.) it is used for the robe or loose upper garment worn by Jonathan the son of Saul; in the other (2 Sam. xiii. 18.) for that worn by the virgin daughters of the king. I cannot approve, therefore, the Vul. Er. and Leo de Juda, for rendering it *tunica*; nor Cas. who translates it *indusium*. I think Be. has done better in making it *amiculum*.

21. *Which he had laid aside*, ην γαρ γυμνος. E. T. *For he was naked.* But γυμνος does not always, like the Eng. word *naked*, signify having no clothes on, or being totally uncovered, but not having all the clothes usually worn, particularly not having his mantle. In this sense the word seems to be used, Acts, xix. 16. and in several passages of the O. T.

12. *Come and dine*, δευτε, αριστησατε. Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Venite, prandete* Cas. *Adeste, prandete.* Dod. *Come and refresh yourselves.* Wy. *Come, eat.* Bishop Pearce approves rather, *Come and breakfast*, because it was early, as we learn from verse 4. The same is the reason with the other two Eng. interpreters for departing from the common method. I do not think it a good reason. The ancients used regularly but two meals, we use three. As of our three, dinner and supper have been regarded as the two principal, it has obtained not only with us, but, I believe, over all Europe,

Europe, to call the firſt meal of the ancients, which the Greek named το αριστον, and the Latins *prandium*, by the firſt of the two, which is *dinner*, and the ſecond, το δειπνον of the Greeks, and *cœna* of the Latins, by the laſt, which is *ſupper*. It is the order that has fixed the names, and not the precise time of the day at which they were eaten. This is commonly variable, and the names cannot be gradually altered with the faſhions, much leſs can they be accommodated to every occaſional convenience. Our anceſtors dined at eleven forenoon, and ſupped at five afternoon. But it will not be thought neceſſary that we ſhould call the breakfaſt of our faſhionable people dinner, and their dinner ſupper, becauſe they coincide in time with thoſe meals of their progenitors. To introduce the name *breakfaſt* would but miſlead, by giving a greater appearance of ſimilarity in their manners to our own, than fact will juſtify. *Refreſh yourſelves* is a very vague expreſſion.

12. *None of the diſciples,* ουδεις των μαθητων. Vul. *Nemo diſcumbentium*, doubtleſs from ſome copy which has read ανακειμενων. In this the Vul. has only the concurrence of the Sax. verſion.

13. *Ventured to aſk him,* ετολμα εξετασαι αυτον. E. T. *Durſt aſk him.* An. and Hey. ſay *Offered.* Dod. Weſ. Wor. and Wy. *Preſumed.* Prieſtley, *Thought it neceſſary.* Biſhop Pearce has juſtly remarked concerning the verb τολμαω followed by an infinitive, that it does not always, in the uſe of Gr. authors, ſacred or profane, expreſs the boldneſs or courage implied in the Eng. verb *to dare*, by which it is commonly rendered. But it is equally true, on the other hand, that it is not a mere expletive. When joined with a negative, as in this place, it often expreſſes a diſinclination ariſing from modeſty, delicacy, reſpect, or an averſeneſs to be troubleſome in putting unneceſſary queſtions. The words immediately following, *knowing that it was the maſter*, confirm the interpretation now given. The common verſion, *durſt not*, tends to convey the notion, that our Lord's manner of converſing with his diſciples was harſh and forbidding, than which nothing can be more contrary to truth. *Did not preſume*, is better, as it does not ſuggeſt any auſterity in our Lord; but it plainly implies what is not implied in the words; that in the hiſtorian's judgment, there would have been preſumption in putting in the queſtion. The word *offered* is a mere expletive. *Thought it neceſſary*, though yielding an appoſite meaning in this place, is evidently not the meaning of ετολμα. The terms *ventured not*, in my opinion, come up entirely to the ſenſe of the author; which is, to expreſs a backwardneſs proceeding from no other fear than that which may be the conſequence of the moſt perfect eſteem and veneration. When thoſe ſpoken of are either enemies or indifferent perſons, the verb ετολμα may not improperly be rendered *preſumed* or *durſt*. But that is not the caſe here. See Mr. xii. 34. N.

15. *Loveſt thou me more than theſe?* αγαπας με πλειον τουτων; There is a ſlight ambiguity here in the original, which, after the Eng. tranſlators, I have retained in the verſion. It may either mean, *Loveſt thou me more than thou loveſt theſe things?* that is, thy boats, nets, and other implements of fiſhing, by which thou earneſt a livelihood? or, *Loveſt thou me more than theſe men* [thy fellow-diſciples] *love me?* In the firſt way interpreted, the queſtion is neither ſo cold nor ſo foreign, as ſome have repreſented it. This was probably the laſt time that Peter exerciſed his profeſſion as a fiſherman. Jeſus was about to employ him as an apoſtle; but, as he diſdained all forced obedience, and would accept no ſervice that did not ſpring from choice, and originate in love, he put this queſtion to give Peter an opportunity of profeſſing openly his love, which his late tranſgreſſion had rendered queſtionable, and conſequently his preference of the work in which Jeſus was to employ him, with whatever difficulties and perils it might be accompanied, to any worldly occupation, however gainful. In the other way interpreted, the queſtion muſt be conſidered as having a reference to the declaration formerly made by Peter when he ſeemed to arrogate a ſuperiority above the reſt, in zeal for his Maſter, and ſteadineſs in his ſervice. *Though thou ſhouldſt prove a ſnare to them all* (ſays he, Mt. xxvi. 33.) *I never will be enſnared.* This gives a peculiar propriety to Peter's reply here. Convinced at length that his Maſter knew his heart better than he himſelf, conſcious at the ſame time, of the affection which he bore him, he dares make the declaration, appealing to the infallible Judge before whom he ſtood, as the voucher of his truth. But, as to his fellow-diſciples, he is now taught not to aſſume in any thing. He dares not utter a ſingle word which would lead to a compariſon with thoſe, to whom, he knew, his woful defection had made him appear ſo much inferior. To the ſecond interpretation I know it is objected, that our Lord cannot be ſuppoſed to aſk Peter a queſtion, which the latter was not in a capacity to anſwer: for, though he was conſcious of his own love, he could have no certain knowledge of the love of others. But to this it may be juſtly anſwered, that ſuch queſtions are not underſtood to require an anſwer from knowledge, but from opinion. Peter had once ſhown himſelf forward enough to obtrude his opinion unaſked, to the diſadvantage of the reſt, compared with himſelf. When his Lord ſaid to them, *This night ſhall I prove a ſnare to you all;* Peter was the only perſon who ventured to contradict him: for, though he admitted that the prediction might hold with regard to the reſt, he affirmed that an exception ought to be made in his favour. *Though thou ſhouldſt prove a ſnare to THEM all, I never will be enſnared.* His ſilence now on that part of the queſtion which concerned his fellow-diſciples, ſpeaks ſtrongly the ſhame he had on recollecting his former preſumption in boaſting ſuperior zeal and firmneſs; and ſhows that the leſſon of humility and ſelf-knowledge he had ſo lately received, had not been loſt.—I incline rather to this ſecond interpretation; but, as the conſtruction will admit either, and as neither of them is unſuitable to the context and the occaſion, I thought it the ſafer method in a tranſlator,

to

to give the expreſſion in the ſame extent in which the Evangeliſt has given it, and leave the choice free to his readers. It may be proper juſt to mention a third meaning which has been put upon the words, and of which, it muſt be owned, they are naturally ſuſceptible: *Loveſt thou me more than thou loveſt theſe thy fellow-diſciples?* This, in my judgment, is the leaſt probable of them all. Our Lord was ſo far from ever ſhowing a jealouſy of this kind, leſt any of his diſciples ſhould rival him in the affection of the reſt, that it was often his aim to excite them in the warmeſt manner to mutual love; urging, amongſt other motives, that he will conſider their love to one another as the ſureſt evidence of their regard and affection to him, and requiring ſuch manifeſtations of their love to the brethren, as he had given of his love to them, and as ſhow it to be hardly poſſible that they could exceed this way.

16. *Tend my ſheep*, ποιμαινε τα προβατα μυ. E. T. *Feed my ſheep*. This is the tranſlation given alſo to the words βοσκε τα προβατα μυ in the next verſe. But the precepts are not ſynonymous. The latter is properly, provide them in paſture; the former implies alſo guide, watch, and defend them. As there is in the original ſome difference in every one of the three injunctions at this time laid on Peter, there ought to be a correſponding difference in the verſion. Yet none of our Eng. interpreters ſeem to have adverted to this. The Vul. muſt have read differently, as it has *Paſce agnos meos*. But in this reading it has not the ſupport of a ſingle MS. and only the Sax. verſion.

22, 23. *If I will that he wait my return*, εαν αυτον θελω μενειν εως ερχομαι. Vul. *Sic eum volo manere donec veniam*. This verſion, which totally alters the ſenſe, has no ſupport from Gr. MSS. or fathers, or from any ancient tranſlation but the Sax. The Cam. verſe 22. reads, Εαν αυτον θελω ὑτως μενειν; but, as it retains εαν, the addition of ὑτως makes no material change in the ſenſe; whereas the Vul. has, in both verſes, turned a mere ſuppoſition into an affirmation. Some La. MSS. read, agreeably to the Cam. *Si ſic eum volo manere*; and ſome, agreeably to the common Gr. *Si eum volo manere*. The Jeſuit Maldonat gives up the reading of the Vul. in this place entirely, and even expreſſes himſelf with an aſperity which will be thought ſurpriſing, when it is conſidered that his argument here hurts not the Proteſtants, but his own friends and brethren alone. Speaking of the three La. readings given above, he ſays, "Prima eſt illa maximè "vulgaris, quæ in omnes fere Latinos pervaſit codices, "eoſque incredibili ſcriptorum negligentia conta-"minavit, *Sic eum volo manere donec veniam, quid ad "te?* nulla prorſus ſpecie probabilitatis," &c. Where is now the merit which this ſon of Loyola boaſted (when, commenting on a paſſage liable to the like objections) of reſigning entirely his own judgment in deference to the authority of the church? Ch. viii. 1—11. N. There, indeed, after candidly admitting the weight of the arguments on the oppoſite ſide, he replies in this manner: "Sed hæc omnia minus habent "ponderis quam una auctoritas eccleſiæ, quæ per "concilium Tridentinum, non ſolum libros omnes, "quos nunc habet in uſu, ſed ſingulas etiam ejus "partes, tanquam canonicas approbavit." Had this good father forgotten that the reading "Sic eum volo "manere," which he ſo diſdainfully reprobates, has the ſanction of the council of Trent, for it had been the common reading of the Vul. long before, and was in all their approved editions at the time? Had he forgotten that it was firſt ratified by Pope Sixtus the fifth, after the reviſal appointed by him, and then by Pope Clement the eighth, after a ſecond reviſal appointed by him? Not one paſſage in the Vul. can claim the authority of Popes and Councils, if this cannot.

25. *I imagine the world itſelf could not contain.*—I agree perfectly with thoſe interpreters who think that the hyperbolé contained in this verſe is much more tolerable, than the torture to which ſome critics have put the words, in order to make them ſpeak a different ſenſe. For ſome appoſite examples of ſuch hyperbolés, both in ſacred authors and in profane, I refer the reader to Biſhop Pearce. For a refutation of the opinion of Ham, who ſeems to think that the two laſt verſes were not written by the Evangeliſt, but by the Aſiatic biſhops, and of the opinion of Gro. and L. Cl. who think that the whole laſt chapter is of another hand, I refer him to Wetſtein.

THE END.

INDEX OF TEXTS

IN THE

OTHER BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE,

AND THE

APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS,

Occaſionally Illuſtrated.

In the References to the PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS, D. means Diſſertation, P. Part, N. Note. In the References to the Notes on the Goſpels, the chapter and verſe of the Goſpel, and the number of the Note, when there are more Notes than one on the ſame verſe, are marked in the ſame manner as in the Notes themſelves. The Prefaces to the Goſpels thus; Pr. Mt. Pr. Mr. Pr. L. Pr. J.

GENESIS.

I. 1—5. - - D. III. § 4—9.
—11. - - Mt. vi. 30.
—16. - - L. ix. 48.
II. 4. - - Mt. i. 1.
—23. - - D. VIII. P. II. § 4.
—24. - - Mt. xix. 5.
VI. 9. - - L. xvi. 8. 3.
XIII. 4. - - J. viii. 25.
XVII. 10, &c. - J. vii. 22.
———12. - - Mt. ii. 16. 3.
XXI. 1. - - Mt. iv. 7. 2.
XXIII. 3, &c. - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XXIV. 3. - - Mt. xxvi. 63.
———18. - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
———54. 56. 59. Mt. vi. 13.
XXVI. 19. - J. iv. 10. 2.
XXVII. 30, &c. - D. VI. P. III. § 4.
XXVIII. 10. - J. v. 2. 2.
XXXI. 35. - D. VII. P. I. § 8.
XXXII. 4, 5. - Ibid.
XXXV. 18. - Mt. xxvii. 50.
XXXVII. 35. - D. VI. P. II. § 3.
XXXIX. 17. - Mt. ii. 16.
XLI. 2, 3. - J. ii. 14. 2.
XLII. 38. - D. VI. P. 2. § 3.
XLIII. 18. 20. - J. viii. 25.
XLV. 8. - - D. XII. P. I. § 32.
—— 26. - - Mr. iii. 21. 4.
XLVIII. 20. - J. i. 15. 2.
XLIX. 3, 4. - L. ii. 23.
L. 2. 5. - - J. xix. 40.

EXODUS.

XII. 6. - - Mr. xv. 42.
——14. - - Mt. xiv. 23.
——46. - - Mt. i. 22.
XV. 2. - - J. xi. 25.
—— 3. - - Mr. xii. 29.
XVI. 5. 23. - J. xix. 14.
XVIII. 7. - - Mt. ii. 2. 2.

XIX. 10. 14. 22 - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXIV. 17. - - J. v. 37, 38.

LEVITICUS.

X. 1, &c. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XI. 42, &c. - ———— § 11.
— 43. - - L. xiv. 26. 2.
XII. 3. - - Mt. ii. 16. 3. J. vii. 22.
XIV. 5. - - J. iv. 10. 3.
XX. 25, 26. - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXI. 1—6. - Ibid.
XXII. 32. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXIV. 11. 14. - D. IX. P. II. § 12.
——— 16. - ————— § 10.

NUMBERS.

III. 32 - - J. xv. 18.
V. 17. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
—22. - - Mt. v. 18.
IX. 12. - - Mt. i. 22.
— 15, 16. - J. v. 37, 38.
XII. 8. - - Ibid.
XV. 37. - - Mt. ix. 20.
——38, 39. - D. VIII. P. III. § 2.
XIX. 7, 8. 10. - L. ii. 22.
XX. 12. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXII. 29. - - Mt. ii. 16.
XXIV. 7. - - J. vii. 38.
XXXIL 19. - Mt. iv. 15.
——— 24. - ——— 4.
XXXIII. 55. - Mt. vii. 3.

DEUTERONOMY.

IV. 12. 15. - - J. v. 37, 38.
VI. 4. - - Mr. xii. 29.
— 8 - - Mt. xxiii. 5.
VIII. 3. - - Mt. iv. 4.
X. 16. - - D. IV. § 22.
XVI. 2. - - J. xix. 14.
XVIII. 10, 11. - D. VI. P. II. § 15.
XXII. 12. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 2. Mt. ix. 20.
—— 19. - - L. vi. 22. 2.
—— 23, 24. - Mt. i. 19. 3.
XXIII. 12, &c. - D. VI. P. IV. § 10.
XXV. 1. - - Mt. xxvii. 24.
—— 5. - - Mt. xxii. 24.
XXVII. 4. - J. iv. 20.
XXX. 11—14. - L. xvii. 21.
XXXII. 4. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
——— 17. - - ——— P. I. § 15.
——— 22. - ——— P. II. § 6.
XXXIII. 8. - - ——— P. IV. § 6.

JOSHUA.

II. 9. 24. - - Mt. xv. 32.
III. 5. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
VII. 13. - - Ibid.
—— 18, 19. - J. ix. 24.
XV. 8. - - D. VI. P. II. § 1.
XX. 7. - - ——— P. IV. § 12.
XXI. 32. - - J. iv. 5.
XXIII. 13. - Mt. vii. 3.
XXIV. 19. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.

JUDGES.

I. 16. - - Mr. i. 3.
IX. 7. - - Mt. vi. 30.
XVI. 10. - - Mt. ii. 16.
XVII. 3. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.

RUTH.

I. 11. - - J. xv. 6.
II. 4. - - L. i. 28. 2.

I. SAMUEL.

I. 23. - - Mt. iv. 4.
IV. 7, 8. - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
— 17 - - D. V. P. II. § 1.
VI. 20. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
VII. 9. - - D. VII. P. II. § 7.
XIV. 45. - - Mt. xvi. 22. 3.
XVIII. 4. - - J. xxi. 7.
XXI. 6. - - Mt. xii. 4.
XXIV. 6. - - D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XXV. 21. - - L. xx. 13.
XXVIII. 7. &c. - D. VI. P. II. § 15.

II. SAMUEL.

I. 17. - - Mt. xi. 17.
— 20. - - D. V. P. II. § 1.
XI. 11. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XII. 14. - - D. IX. P. II. § 11.
XIII. 18. - - J. xxi. 7.

I. KINGS.

I. 14. - - Mt. i. 22.
IV. 33. - J. xix. 29.
XVIII. 7. 13. - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
——— 31, &c. - ——— P. II. § 7.
XIX. 13. - - Mt. vii. 15. 2.
—— 16. - - D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XX. 4. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XXI. 10. - - D. IX. P. II. § 8.

II. KINGS.

I. 7, 8. - - Mt. vii. 15. 2.
II. 13. - - Ibid.
— 19. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
IV. 16. 28. - - Ibid.
VI. 21. - - Ibid.

VII. 2. 17. 19. - Ibid.
XVIII. 30. 33. &c. D. IX. P. II. § 10.
XIX. 4. 16. 22, 23. ——————— § 12.
XXII. 6. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXIII. 10 - - D. VI. P. II. § 1.

I. CHRONICLES.

V. 1, 2. - - L. ii. 23.
XI. 11. - - J. xv. 18.
— 19. - - Mt. xvi. 22. [3]
XXIV. 3, &c. - L. i. 5.

II. CHRONICLES.

II. 14, 15. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
IV. 5. - - J. ii. 6.
XXIV. 12. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXIX. 5, &c. - D. VI P. IV. § 10.
XXX. 16, 17, 18. ——————— § 11. J. xix. 14.
XXXIII. 6. - ——— P. II. § 1.
XXXIV. 11. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XXXV. 7, 8, 9. 11. J. xix. 14.
XXXVI. 22. - D. VI. P. V. § 2.

EZRA.

III. 7. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
VIII. 25. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.

NEHEMIAH.

III. 1. 32. - - J. v. 2. [2]
VIII. 8. - - D. X. P. V. § 4.
XII. 39. - - J. v. 2. [2]
—— 46. - - J. xv. 18.
XIII. 25. - - Mt. xv. 4.

ESTHER.

IV. 13. - - L. xiv. 26. [2]
V. 10. - - L. ii. 49.
VI. 12. - - Ibid.
VII. 9. - - Ibid.

JOB.

III. 8. - - Mt. iii. 7.
IX. 21. 23. - - L. xii. 25.
XI. 7, 8, 9. - D. VI. P. II. § 7.
XXXI. 7. - - J. xx. 17.
XXXVIII. 17. - D. VI. P. II. § 9.
XXXIX. 9. - - L. ii. 7.

PSALMS.

I. 6. - - D. IV. § 21.
II. 2. - - D. V. P. IV. § 4.
IV. 1. - - D. XI. P. I. § 19.
XVI. 8. - - D. IV. § 20.
—— 10. - - D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11.
XX. 1. 7. - - J. xvii. 11.
XXXIV. 18. - Mt. v. 3. [3]
XXXVII. 11. 29. - ——— 5. [2]
XXXIX. 3. - - L. xvii. 21.
——— 5. - L. xii. 25.
XLI. 1. - - Mt. xiii. 19.
XLIX. 2. - - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
LXIII. title. - Mr. i. 3.
——— 1. - - Mt. v. 6.
LXXIII. 9. - D. V. P. I. § 4.
LXXVI. 1. - - J. xvii. 11.
LXXXII. 6. - J. x. 35.
LXXXVI. 2. - D. VI. P. IV. § 15.
XCV. 8. - - D. IV. § 22.
XCVI. 5. - - D. VI. P. I. § 15.
XCVIII. 3. - - L. i. 54, 55. [2]
XCIX. 3. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CII. 25. - - Mt. xxv. 34.
CIII. 1. - - L. xvii. 21.
CIV. 4. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 10.
CV. 15. - - D. V. P. IV. § 2.
CVI. 7. - - Mt. xiii. 19.
—— 16. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 5.
CIX. 22. - - L. xvii. 21.
CXI. 9. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CXVIII. 26. - - D. V. P. II. § 12. Mt. xi. 3.
CXXXI. 2. - - L. xiv. 26. [2]
CXXXII. 17. - J. v. 35.
CXXXIX. 8. - D. VI. P. II. § 7.
CXLV. 17. - ——— P. IV. § 19.

PROVERBS.

V. 4. - - Mt. xxvii. 34.
VI. 32. - - Mt. v. 28.
VIII. passim. - J. i. 1.
XIV. 4. - - L. ii. 7.
XVII. 15. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 17. Mt. xxvii. 24.
———20. - - D. IV. § 22.
XXI. 12. - - Mt. xiii. 19.
XXIV. 10. - - Mt. xv. 32.
XXIX. 24. - - L. xiv. 26. [2]
XXX. 30. - - L. i. 28. [3]

ECCLESIASTES.

V. 2. - - L. ii. 14.
VIII. 11. - - L. i. 1.

CANTICLES.

I. 8. - - L. i. 28. [3]
III. 10. - - L. xvii. 21.
VIII. 6. - - D. VI. P. II. § 10.

ISAIAH.

I. 3. - - L. ii. 7.
—29. - - L. xvi. 21.

II. 20. - - D. XI. P. I. § 19.
V. 1. - - D. X. P. IV. § 6.
— 4. - - Mt. xxvii. 34.
— 14. - - D. VI. P. II. § 8.
— 20. - - L. xxiii. 54.
VI. 1, &c. - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
VII. 23. - - D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
VIII. 12, 13. - D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
—— 19. - - —— P. II. § 15. D. I. P. II. § 3.
XI. 1. - - Mt. ii. 23. [2]
XII. 1. - - Mt. xi. 25. [2]
XIV. 9. - - D. VI. P. II. § 8.
—— 21. - - L. xxii. 36.
XVI. 11. - L. xvii. 21.
XXIX. 4. - - D. I. P. II. § 3. D. VI. P. II. § 15.
——— 11, 12. - J. vii. 15.
——— 19. - - L. vi. 35.
XXX. 24. - Mt. iii. 12.
XXXIV. 13. - Mt. xxvii. 29.
XXXVIII. 10. - D. VI. P. II. § 17.
XL. 3. - - ——— P. V. § 4.
—— 30, 31. - Mt. xv. 32.
XLI. 7. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XLII. 1. - - L. xxiii. 35.
—— 3. - - Mt. xii. 20.
—— 18. - - Mr. viii. 24.
XLV. 1. - - D. V. P. IV. § 2.
XLVIII. 13. - Mt. xxv. 34.
LII. 7. - - D. V. P. II. § 3.
LIII. 8. - - L. xvi. 8. [3]
LV. 1, 2. - - Mt. v. 6.
—— 3. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
LVIII. 2. - - L. xvi. 21.
LXI. 1, 2. - - D. V. P. II. § 2. D. VI. P. V. § 5.
LXV. 5. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 11.

JEREMIAH.

I. 5. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 13.
IV. 13. - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
VI. 4. - - Ibid. D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IX. 17, 18, 20. - Mt. xi. 17. L. xxii. 36.
XII. 3. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
XXXIX. 11. - D. VII. P. II. § 4.
XLIV. 17. - Mt. iv. 4.

LAMENTATIONS.

III. 15. - - Mt. xxvii. 34.
V. 16 - - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.

EZEKIEL.

III. 7. - - D. IV. § 22.
XXXIX. 17—20. L. xxii. 36.
XLI. 6. - - J. xx. 17.

DANIEL.

II. 44. - - D. V. P. I. § 1.
IV. 26. - - ———— § 4.
VII. 13, 14. - D. V. P. I. § 1. & P. IV. § 13.
VIII. 1. - - J. viii. 25.
IX. 25, 26. - D. V. P. IV. § 3.
X. 16. - - L. xvii. 21.

HOSEA.

I. 2. - - Mr. i. 1.
XI. 1. - - Mt. i. 22.

AMOS.

II. 6. - - Mt. x. 10. [3]
VI. 4. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
VIII. 6. - - Mt. x. 10. [3]

JONAH.

III. 2. - - D. VI. P. V. § 2. 8.

MICAH.

III. 5. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IV. 6, 7. - - D. V. P. I. § 1.
V. 2. - - Mt. ii. 6. [2]
VI. 5. 8. - - Mt. vi. 33.

HABAKKUK.

III. 2. - - L. i. 54, 55. [2]

ZECHARIAH.

I. 20. - - Mt. xiii. 55.
XI. 12, 13. - - Mt. xxvii. 9, 10.
XIII. 4. - - Mt. vii. 15. [2].

MALACHI.

III. 1. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 15.

ACTS.

I. 4. 8. - - D. V. P. II. § 14.
— 6. - - Mt. xvii. 11.
— 13. - - Mt. i. 6.
— 16. - - D. XII. P. I. § 18.
II. 23. - - D. IV. § 21.
— 25. - - ——— § 20.
— 27. - - D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11, 12.
— 38. - - ———P. III. § 7.
III. 16. - - Mr. xi. 22.
— 19. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 21. - - Mt. xv. 1.
IV. 1. - - L. xxii. 52.
— 4. - - L. i. 2.
— 6. - - L. iii. 2.
— 26, 27. - - D. V. P. IV. § 4.
— 32. - - J. v. 18.
— 33. - - L. ii. 40.
V. 24. 26. - L. xxii. 52.
— 33. - - J. xii. 10.

V. 39. - - Mt. xxv. 9.
VI. 1, &c. - - D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 4. - - L. i. 2.
— 11. - - D. IX. P. II. § 8.
— 13. - - ———— § 14.
VII. 10. 20. - L. ii. 40.
—— 53. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
—— 59. - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
VIII. 4. - - L. i. 2.
—— 22. - - D. IV. § 23. D. VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 35. - - D. VI. P. V. § 14.
—— 39. - - Mt. iii. 11.
IX. 29. - - D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 31. - - J. xiv. 16.
X. 22. - - Mt. ii. 12.
— 44. - - L. i. 2.
— 45. - - J. xx. 27.
XI. 18. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 19. - - L. i. 2.
— 20. - - D. I. P. I. § 6.
—26. - - D. IX. P. I. § 10. Mt. ii. 12.
XII. 5. - - L. vi. 12.
XIII. 2. - - D XI. P. I. § 12.
—— 10. - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
—— 22. - - L. iv. 22.
—— 25. - - L. xii. 25.
—— 34. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
—— 42. - - ——— P. V. § 12.
—— 43. - - J. i. 17.
—— 45. - - D. IX. P. II. § 12.
—— 50. - - L. xiv. 1.
XIV. 15. - - D. IV. § 25.
—— 23. - - D. X. P. V. § 7.
—— 25. - - L. i. 2.
XV. 37. - - J. xii. 10.
XVI. 1. - - J. xx. 27.
—— 6. - - L. i. 2.
—— 13. 16. - L. vi. 12.
—— 30. - - D. VII. P. I. § 7.
—— 33. - - J. ix. 7.
XVII. 3. - - D. V. P. IV. § 6.
—— 4. - - L. xiv. 1.
—— 11. - - L. i. 2.
—— 13. - - Mt. xv. 1.
—— 18. - - D. VI. P. I. § 12, 13. 17.
—— 22. - - ———— § 22.
—— 30. - - ——— P. III. § 7.
XVIII. 5. 28. - D. V. P. IV. § 6.
——— 6. - - D. IX. P. II. § 12.
——— 23. - - L. i. 3. 2.
——— 26. - - Mt. xvi. 22.
XIX. 16. - - J. xxi. 7. 2.
XX. 7. 9. - - D. VI. P. V. § 12.
—— 18. - - Mt. xxviii. 9.
—— 21. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 24. - - D. V. P. II. § 16. L. xii. 25.
—— 32. - - J. i. 17.
XXI. 8. - - D. VI. P. V. § 16.
XXII. 5. - - L. xxii. 66.
XXIII. 1. - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
XXIII. 8. - - D. VI. P. II. § 23. Mt. xxii. 23.
XXIV. 5. 14. - D. IX. P. IV. § 2, 3, 4.
XXV. 2. - - L. xiv. 1.
—— 11. 25. - L. xxiii. 15.
—— 19. - - D. VI. P. I. § 22.
XXVI. 5. - - D. IV. § 21.
——— 18. - - D. X. P. IV. § 15.
——— 20. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
——— 24. - - J. vii. 15.
——— 31. - - L. xxiii. 15.
XXVII. 20. - Mt. xxvi. 45.
——— 40. - - L. iv. 42.
XXVIII. 7. - - J. xv. 18.
———— 17. - - L. xiv. 1.
——— 31. - - D. VI. P. V. § 7.

ROMANS.

I. 4. - - D. XI. P. I. § 7.
— 9. - - { D. V. P. II. § 19. D. XI. P. I. § 12.
II. 5. - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
— 21. - - ——— P. V. § 10.
III. 11. - - Mt. xiii. 19.
——21, 22. - - Mt. vi. 33.
——22. 26. - Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 21. - - L. i. 1.
VI. 17. - - Mt. xi. 25.
VII. 3. - - Mt. ii. 12.
—— 12. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 7.
X. 1. - - L. vi. 12.
— 2. - - L. iv. 22.
— 3. - - Mt. vi. 33.
— 6, 7. - - D. VI. P. II. § 14. L. xvii. 21.
— 10. - - D. IV. § 23.
— 15. - - D. V. P. II. § 3, 4, 5.
—16, 17. - - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
XI. 2. - - D. IV. § 21.
— 14. - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 22. - - Mt. xxiv. 51.
— 29. - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
XII. 3. 6. - - D. IV. § 13, 14.
XIV. 5. - - L. i. 1.
—— 17. - - L. xvii. 21.
XV. 30. - - L. vi. 12.
XVI. 25, 26. - D. V. P. II. § 20. D. IX. P. I. § 3.

I. CORINTHIANS.

I. 10. - - D. IX. P. III. § 4.
—17. - - D. I. P. I. § 10.
—21. - - D. VI. P. V. § 10.
—30. - - J. xi. 25.
II. 4, 5. - - D. VI. P. V. § 10. D. I. P. I. § 10.
— 7—10. - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
III. 2. - - L. i. 64.
— 11. - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.
IV. 1. - - D. IX. P. I. § 6.
VI. 3. - - Mt. xii. 23.
— 12. - - L. xxii. 25.

VII. 2. - - J. v. 18.
—— 12, 13, 14. - J. xx. 27.
—— 14. D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
—— 39. - - J. iii. 21.
VIII. 3. - - D. IV. § 21.
—— 4. - - D. VI. P. I. § 15.
—— 13. - - J. viii. 51.
IX. 18. - - D. V. P. II. § 19.
X. 16. - - Mt. xiv. 19.
— 17. - - Mt. xxvi. 26.
— 20, 21. - - D. VI. P. I. § 14—18.
XI. 10. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 19. - - D. IX. P. IV. § 3.
XII. 12. - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
XIV. 2. 12. - D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
—— 11. - - D. I. P. I. § 14.
—— 32. - - —— P. II. § 3.
XV. 54. - - L. ii. 2. 3.
——55. - - D. VI. P. II. § 18. 23.
XVI. 11. - - L. xi. 7.

II. CORINTHIANS.

I. 17. - - J. xii. 10.
—20. - - Mt. v. 37.
III. 14. - - D. V. P. III. § 3.
IV. 2. - - J. i. 17.
— 16. - - Mt. xv. 32.
V. 6, &c. - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
— 13. - - Mr. iii. 21. 4.
VI. 1. - - J. i. 17.
VII. 1. - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N. 3.
—— 4. - - Mr. x. 30.
—— 8. 10. - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
VIII. 18. - - D. V. P. II. § 19.
XII. 1, &c. - - D. VI. P. II. § 21. 23.
—— 7. - - Mt. vii. 3.
—— 18. - - Mt. xii. 23.
XIII. 8. - - J. i. 17.

GALATIANS.

I. 23. - - D. VI. P. V. § 14.
II. 2. 7. - - D. V. P. II. § 20.
— 3. - - Mt. i. 19.
— 16. 20. - - Mr. xi. 22.
— 21. - - J. i. 17.
III. 1. - - Ibid.
— 3. - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 9. - - J. xx. 27.
— 19. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 22. - - Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 4. - - L. i. 35.
— 9. - - J. iii. 3.
— 19. - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
— 22. - - D. IX. P. I. § 7.
V. 4. 7. - - J. i. 17.
— 12. - - Mt. xxiv. 51.
— 19, 20, 21. - D. I. P. I. § 11. N. D. IX. P. IV. § 11.
VI. 9. - - Mt. xv. 32.

EPHESIANS.

I. 9. - - D. IX. P. I. § 3. 11.
— 13. - - D. V. P. II. § 16.
II. 12. - - D. VI. P. I. § 16.
— 20. - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.
III. 3. 5, 6, 9. - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
— 7. - - J. iv. 10.
— 13. - - Mt. xv. 32.
— 18. - - L. xi. 7.
IV. 7. - - J. iv. 10.
— 11. - - D. VI. P. V. § 16.
— 18. - - D. IV. § 23. N.
— 20. - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
— 21. - - J. i. 17.
— 29. - - L. ii. 40.
V. 32. - - D. IX. P. I. § 7. D. X. P. III. § 9.
VI. 19. - - —— § 3.

PHILIPPIANS.

I. 21. - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
II. 10. - - —— § 6.
III. 9. - - Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 6. - - Mt. vi. 25.
— 15. - - D. V. P. II. § 19.

COLOSSIANS.

I. 20. - - Mt. v. 9.
—26, 27. - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
II. 22. - - Mt. xv. 9.
III. 8. - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
IV. 6. - - L. ii. 40.

II. THESSALONIANS.

I. 12. - - J. i. 17.
II. 7. - - D. IX. P. I. § 4.
— 11. - - Mt. vi. 13.
— 12. - - J. i. 17.
— 15. - - Pr. Mt. § 8.
III. 8. - - Mt. vi. 25.

I. TIMOTHY.

I. 13. - - D. IX. P. II. § 13. D. X. P. V. § 11.
—15. - - J. xv. 18.
II. 4. - - D. X. P. V. § 8.
—8. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
III. 11. - - ——P. I. § 2.
——15. - - J. i. 17.
——16. - - D. IX. P. I. § 13.
IV. 1. - - D. VI. P. I. § 20.
— 3. - - J. i. 17.
— 3. 10. 12. - J. xx. 27.
— 5. - - Mr. vii. 2.

IV. 6. - - L. i. 3.
— 10. - - D. X. P. V. § 8.
V. 8. - - Mt. vi. 25.
— 13. - - Mt. xii. 36.
— 16. - - J. xx. 27.
VI. 2. - - Ibid.

II. TIMOTHY.

II. 7. - - Mt. xxiv. 15. [3].
— 15. - - J. i. 17.
III. 3. - - D. VI. P. I. § 2.
——4. - - L. i. 3. [3].
——8. - - J. i. 17.
——10. - - L. i. 3.
——15. - - J. vii. 15.
IV. 2. - - D. VI. P. V. § 10. L. i. 2.
——4. - - J. i. 17.
——5. - - D. VI. P. V. § 16. L. i. 1.
——7. - - L. xii. 25.
——8. - - Mt. xxvi. 45.
——17. - - L. i. 1.

TITUS.

I. 8. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
—12. - - Mt. xii. 36.
—14. - - J. i. 17.
II. 3. - - D. VI. P. I. § 2.
— 11. - - D. X. P. V. § 8. N. J. i. 17.
III. 10, 11. - D. IX. P. IV. § 11, 12.

HEBREWS.

I. 2. - - J. i. 3.
—3. - - D. X. P. V. § 9.
—4, &c. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11.
—7. - - L. xix. 9.
III. 1. - - J. x. 36.
IV. 2. - - D. V. P. II. § 6.
— 9. - - Mt. v. 5. [2].
VI. 4. - - J. iv. 10.
VII. 21. - - D. VI. P. III. § 9.
—— 26. - - ——— P. IV. § 7.
IX. 9. - - Mt. xiii. 3.
— 10. - - Mr. vii. 4.
— 16, 17. - - D. V. P. III. § 1.
X. 13. - - Mt. xxvi. 45.
— 26. - - J. i. 17.
— 36. - - L. viii. 15.
— 37. - - Mt. xi. 3.
— 38. - - D. X. P. V. § 10.
XI. 11. - - L. xii. 25.
— 19. - - Mt. xiii. 3.
— 37. - - Mt. vii. 15. [2].
XII. 3. - - L. viii. 15.
——17. - - D. VI. P. III. § 4.
—— 25. - - Mt. ii. 12.
XIII. 19. - - Mt. xvii. 11.
—— 24. - - Mt. xv. 1.

JAMES.

I. 2. - - Mr. x. 30.
—8. - - D. IV. § 19.
—13. - - Mt. iv. 7. [2].
—20. - - Mt. vi. 33.
II. 7. - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
III. 1. - - D. VII. P. I. § 12.
——6. - - L. xii. 25. D. VI. P. II. § 1.
——15. - - D. VI. P. I. § 21.
V. 12. - - Mt. v. 37.
— 17. - - D. IV. § 25.
— 19. - - J. i. 17.

I. PETER.

I. 2. 20. - - D. IV. § 21.
—22. - - J. i. 17.
II. 6, 7. - - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
—24. - - Mt. viii. 17.
III. 5, 6. - - D. VII. P. I. § 6.
— 16. - - Mt. v. 44. [2]. D. XI. P. II. § 6.
—20, 21. - - D. IX. P. I. § 8.
V. 8. - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
— 12. - - J. i. 17.

II. PETER.

II. 1. - - D. IX. P. IV. § 10.
— 2. - - J. i. 17.
— 4. - - D. VI. P. II. § 19.
— 14. - - Mr. vii. 22.

I. JOHN.

I. 8. - - D. X. P. V. § 12.
II. 1. - - J. xiv. 16.
— 21. - - J. i. 17.
III. 9. - - D. X. P. V. § 12.

II. JOHN.

2. - - J. i. 17.

III. JOHN.

4. - - J. xvi. 2.
8. - - J. i. 17.
9. - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.

REVELATIONS.

I. 12. - - J. i. 23.
—13. - - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
—16. - - J. vii. 24.
—20. - - D. IX. P. I. § 7.
II. 1. 8. 12. 18. - D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
— 5. 16. 21. 22. - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 7. - - ——— P. II. § 21.
— 7. 11. 17. 29 - D. II. P. III. § 5.

III. 1. 7. 14. - D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
——4. - - J. xvii. 11.
——19. - - D. VI. P. III. § 7.
IV. 8, &c. - - ——— P. IV. § 14.
V. 1. - - D. II. P. I. § 3.
— 2. - - D. VI. P. V. § 8.
— 8. - - L. vi. 12.
— 13. - - D. VI. P. II. § 6.
VI. 6. - - D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5.
— 8. - - D. VI. P. II. § 13.
— 14. - - D. II. P. I. § 3.
VIII. 3. - - L. vi. 12.
—— 7. - - Mt. vi. 30.
IX. 20. - - D. VI. P. I. § 19.
X. 7. - - ——— P. V. § 14.
XII. 12. - - J. i. 14. [2].
XIII. 6. - - Ibid.
XIV. 6, 7. - - D. V. P. II. § 17.
XV. 4. - - D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
XVI. 11. - - D. IX. P. II. § 11.
XVII. 7. - - ——— P. I. § 7.
XIX. 17, 18. - L. xxii. 36.
XX. 2. - - D. VI. P. I. § 3.
—— 14. - - ——— P. II. § 13.
XXI. 3. - - L. xvi. 9. [3]. J. i. 14. [2].

TOBIT.

II. 1. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

JUDITH.

IX. 11. - - L. vi. 35.
XII. 15. - - D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

WISDOM.

VII. 3. . - D. IV. § 25.
VIII. 19, 20. - D. VI. P. II. § 19.
XI. 14. - - Mt. v. 6.
XVI. 13. - - D. VI. P. II. § 17.
—— 25. - - J. iv. 10.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

XIX. 26. - - L. xvii. 21.
XXIV. 31. - Mr. vi. 40.
XXV. 26. - - Mt. xxiv. 51.
XXVI. 7. - - Mt. v. 28.
XXXII. 18. - L. xviii. 7.

I. MACCABEES.

II. 21. - - Mt. xvi. 22. [3].
— 29. - - Mt. vi. 33.
IV. 48. - - L. xvii. 21.
— 59. - - J. x. 22.

II. MACCABEES.

II. 29. - - Mt. xxv. 34.
VII. 41. - - J. xv. 18.

INDEX

OF

GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES

Occasionally Illustrated.

A

Αβυσσος	-	D. VI. P. II. § 14.
Αγαθος	-	Mt. xxv. 26.
Αγαλλιαω	-	J. viii. 56.
Αγαπη μα	-	J. xv. 10.
Αγγελος	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 8—16.
Αγιος	-	D. VI. P. IV.
—— τε θεε	-	D. V. P. IV. § 14. L. iv. 34.
Αγιον πνευμα	-	Mt. iii. 11. [2.]
Αγναφος	-	Mt. ix. 16.
Αδης	-	D. VI. P. II.
Αδικια	-	J. vii. 18.
Αδικος	-	Mt. xxv. 26.
Αζυμα	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
Αιρεσις	-	D. IX. P. IV.
Αιρω	-	J. x. 18.
Αιτεω	-	J. xvi. 30.
Αιχμαλωσια	-	Mt. i. 11, 12.
Αιων	-	Mt. xii. 32.
εις τον Αιωνα	-	J. viii. 51.
εκ τε Αιωνος	-	J. ix. 32.
Αιωνιος	-	L. xvi. 9. [3.]
Ακαθαρτα, Ακαθαρτος		Mt. xxvii. 29.
Ακοη	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15.
Ακουω	-	J. viii. 43. Mr. iv. 24.
Ακριβοω	-	Mt. ii. 7.
Ακρις	-	Mt. iii. 4. [2.]
Αληθης ους	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
ἡ Αληθεια	-	J. i. 17.
Αληθης	-	J. v. 31.
Αληθινος	-	J. vii. 28. [2.]
Αλλα	-	Mt. xx. 23.
Αμαρτια	-	J. viii. 46. [2.]
Αμαρτωλος	-	Mt. xxvi. 45. [2.]
Αμεταμελητος	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
Αμεταμητος	-	Ibid.
Αμην	-	Mt. v. 18.
Αμφιβληστρον	-	Mt. iv. 18.
Αναβαινω	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Αναβλεπω	-	Mr. viii. 24.
Αναγκαζω	-	L. xxiv. 29.
Αναθεμα	-	Mt. xv. 4.
Ανακειμαι	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 5.
Ανακλινω	-	Ibid.
Αναλαμβανω	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Αναλημψις	-	L. ix. 51.
Αναλογια της πιστεως		D. IV. § 4.
Αναπιπτω	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
Αναπληροω	-	Mt. xiii. 14.
Αναστασις	-	D. VI. P. II. § 19. Mt. xxii. 23.
Αναστροφη	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Ανατολη	-	Mt. ii. 2. L. i. 78.
Αναφερω	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Ανδρες αδελφοι	-	D. XII. P. I. § 18.

Ἀναθεν - Mt. xxiii. 23.
Ἀναθημα - Mt. vi. 25.
Ἀνθυπατος - D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Ἀνθρωποκτονες - J. viii. 44.
Ἀνιεντες - L. xxiv. 25.
Ἀνομος - Mt. xxv. 26.
Ἀνταλλαγμα - Mr. viii. 37. 2.
Ἀντι - J. i. 16.
Ἀντιδικος - D. VI. P. I. § 3, 4. 8.
Ἀντιπαρερχομαι - L. x. 32.
Ἀντλημα - J. iv. 11.
Ἀνωθεν - J. iii. 3.
Ἀπαγχω - Mt. xxvii. 5.
Ἀπαλλαττω - L. xii. 58.
Ἀπειθων - D. XII. P. I. § 15.
Ἀπελπιζω - L. vi. 35.
Ἀπεχω - Mt. vi. 2.
Ἀπηχη - Mr. xiv. 41. 2.
Ἀπιστια - Mr. ix. 24.
Ἀπιστος - J. xx. 27.
Ἀπλους - Mt. vi. 22.
Απο - Mt. xv. i. L. x. 30.
Απογραφεσθαι - L. ii. 1. 2.
Αποδημεω - Mt. xxi. 33.
Αποικια, αποικεσια - Mt. i. 11, 12.
Αποκαθιστημι - Mt. xvii. 11.
Αποκαλυψις - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
Αποκοπτω - Mt. xxiv. 51.
Απολυω - Mt. i. 19. 3.
Αποστερεω - Mr. x. 19.
Αποστελλω - J. x. 36.
Αποστολος - D. VIII. P. III. § 8.
Αποσυναγωγος - J. ix. 22.
Αποτιμαω - Mt. xxiv. 51.
Αποτιμασθαι - L. ii. 1. 2.
Αποφερω - D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Απτεσθαι - J. xx. 17.
Αργος - Mt. xii. 36.
Αργυριον - D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5. 10.
Αριστεω - J. xxi. 12.
Αρπαζω - D. V. P. II. § 21.
Αρτι - Mt. ix. 18.
Αρτος - Mt. iv. 3. 2. xxvi. 26.
Αρτοι της προθεσεως - Mt. xii. 4. 2.
Αρχη - Mr. i. 1. D. III. § 9.
την Αρχην - J. viii. 25.
Αρχιερευς - Mt. ii. 4.
Αρχιτελωνης - L. xix. 2.
Αρχιτρικλινος - D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
Αρχομενος - L. iii. 23.
Αρχοντες - L. xiv. 1.
Αρχων του κοσμου τουτου, και ἑ - D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Ασκος - Mt. ix. 17.
Ασσαριον - D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Ασπασια - L. xi. 36.
Αυλη - Mt. xxvi. 3. 2.
Αυταρκεια - D. IV. § 18.
Αυτοκατακριτος - D. IX. P. IV. § 12.

Αφιεναι - Mr. vii. 19.
Αφιεναι το πνευμα - Mt. xxvii. 50.
Αφοριζω - L. vi. 22.
Αχρειος - D. XII. P. I. § 14.

B

Βαπτιζω, και ἑ - D. VIII. P. II. § 2. Mt. iii. 11.
Βαπτισμα - Mt. xx. 22. xxi. 25. Mr. vii. 3, 4.
Βαπτισης - Mt. iii. 1. 2.
Βασανιζω - Mt. viii. 6.
Βασανισης - Mt. xviii. 34.
Βασιλεια, και ἑ - D. V. P. I.
Βασιλευς - Mt. ii. 22.
Βαθυλικος - J. iv. 46.
Βαττολογεω - Mt. vi. 7.
Βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως - Mt. xxiv. 15. 2.
Βεελζεβουλ - Mt. ix. 25.
Βιβλιον - D. II. P. I. § 3.
Βιβλος γενεσεως - Mt. i. 1. D. XI. P. I. § 18, 19, 20.
Βλασφημια - D. IX. P. II.
Βοηθεω - Mr. ix. 24.
Βολις - Mt. vii. 3.
Βυλευω - J. xii. 10.
Βυς - J. ii. 14.
Βρωσις - Mt. vi. 19.
Βυθιζομαι - L. v. 7.

Γ

Γαμεω - Mt. xxiv. 38.
Γαστερες αργοι - Mt. xii. 36.
Γεεννα - D. VI. P. II.
Γειτων - D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Γενεα - L. xvi. 8. 3.
Γενεσια - Mt. xiv. 6.
Γενημα της αμπελου - Mt. xxvi. 29.
Γενομενος - J. xiii. 2.
Γενος - Mr. ix. 29.
Γη - Mt. ii. 6. x. 5. 2. xxvii. 45.
Γηγενης - D. V. P. IV. § 13.
Γινεσθαι - L. ii. 2. 3.
Γινωσκω - D. IV. § 21.
Γλωσσα - D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
Γογγυσμος - J. vii. 12.
Γραμματα - —— 15.
Γραμματευς - Mt. ii. 4. 2. D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Γραφη - J. vii. 15.
Γραφω - Mr. xii. 19.
Γυμνος - J. xxi. 7. 2.
Γυνη - Mt. v. 28.

Δ

Δαιμονιον - D. VI. P. I.
Δαιμονιζομενος - —— § 9, 10.

Δαιμονιωδης	D. VI. P. I. § 21.
Δειπνον	J. xxi. 12.
Δεισιδαιμων	D. VI. P. I. § 22.
Δενδρον	Mt. vi. 30.
Δευτεροπρωτος	L. vi. 1.
Δεω	Mt. xviii. 18.
Δηναριον	D. VIII. P. I. § 4. 6. 10.
Δια μεσε	L. xvii. 11.
Διαβαινω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Διαβολος	——— P. I.
Διαθηκη	D. V. P. III.
Διακομιδη	Mt. i. 11, 12.
Διακονος	Mt. xx. 26, 27.
Διαλεγομαι	D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12.
Διανοιγον μητραν	L. ii. 23.
Διαπεραω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων	——— P. I. § 20.
Διδασκαλος	D. VII. P. II. Mt. xxiii. 8.
Διδασκω	D. VI. P. V. Mt. xxviii. 19, 20.
Διδαχη	Mt. vii. 28.
Διδραχμα	D. VIII. P. I. § 8.
Διστης	Mt. ii. 16. [3]
Δικαιος	Mt. i. 19. xxvii. 24. D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
Δικαιοσυνη	Mt. iii. 15. vi. 1. xxi. 32.
Δικαιοσυνη τε Θεε	Mt. vi. 33.
Δικαιοω	L. vii. 35.
Δικτυον	Mt. iv. 18.
Διχοτομεω, διχαζω	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Διψαω	Mt. v. 6.
Διψυχος	D. IV. § 19.
Διωκω	Mt. v. 11.
Δοκεω	Mr. x. 42.
Δοκος	Mt. vii. 3.
Δος δοξαν τε Θεω	J. ix. 24.
Δηλος	D. VII. P. I. Mt. xx. 26, 27.
ὁ Δρακων ὁ μεγας	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Δρομος	L. xii. 25.
Δυναμαι	Mr. ii. 19. [2]
ἡ Δυναται ιδειν	J. iii. 3. [2]
ἡ Δυναμις	Mt. xxvi. 64.
Δωρεα	J. iv. 10.
Δωρον	Mr. vii. 11, 12.

E

Ἐγειρει	Pr. Mt. § 14—20.
Εγγαστριμυθος	D. I. P. I. § 3.
Εγγιζειν	L. xviii. 35.
Εγκαινια	J. x. 22.
Εθναρχης	Mt. ii. 22.
Ει	Mr. viii. 12. [2] xv. 44.
Ειδος	J. v. 37, 38.
Ειδω	L. x. 32.
Ειρηνη	Mt. x. 12.
Ειρηνοποιος	Mt. v. 9.
Εισφερω	Mt. vi. 13.
Εκ	J. iii. 25.
Εκβαλλειν ενομα πονηρον	L. vi. 22.
Εκγαμιζω	Mt. xxiv. 38.
Εκδημεω	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Εκδικεω	L. xviii. 1.
Εκκλησια	Mt. xviii. 17.
Εκκοπτω	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Εκλειπω	L. xvi. 9. [2]
Εκλεκτος	D. XII. P. I. § 15. Mt. xxii. 14.
ὁ Εκλεκτος τε Θεε	D. V. P. IV. § 14.
Εκλυω	Mt. ix. 36. [2] xv. 32.
Εκπειραζω	Mt. iv. 7. [2].
Εκπορευομενον εκ τε στοματος	——— 4.
Ελεγχω	J. viii. 46.
Ελεεω	Mt. ix. 36.
Ελεημων	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Ελεος	Mt. ix. 13. [2]
Ἑλληνις	Mr. vii. 26.
Ἑλληνιζειν	D. I. P. I. § 6.
Εμβριμαομαι	Mr. ix. 25.
Εμπαιζω	Mt. ii. 16.
Εμπροσθεν	J. i. 15. [2]
Εν Θεω	J. iii. 21.
Εν τω ονοματι Θεε	J. xvii. 11.
Εν ὑδατι	Mt. iii. 11.
Εναρετος	Mt. i. 19. xxv. 26.
Ενδημεω	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Ενδυμα	Mt. vii. 15. [2]
Ενεντα	L. xi. 41.
Ενταλμα	Mt. xv. 9.
Ενταφιαζω	J. xix. 40.
Εντολη	Mt. xv. 9.
Εντος	L. xvii. 21.
Ενωπιον Θεε	L. i. 75.
Εξελθειν	Mr. ix. 27.
Εξιστημι	Mr. iii. 21. [4]
Εξοδος	L. ix. 31.
Εξομολογημαι	Mt. xi. 27.
Εξορκιζω	Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7. [2]
Εξιστιαζω	L. xxii. 25.
Εορτη	Mt. xxvi. 5.
Επαγγελια	D. XII. P. I. § 14.
Επανω	L. iv. 39.
Επενδυτης	J. xxi. 7.
Επηρεαζω	Mt. v. 44.
Επι το αυτο	Mt. xxii. 34.
Επι τω ονοματι	Mt. xxiv. 5.
Επιβαλλω	Mr. xiv. 72.
Επιβλος	D. VI. P. I. § 6.
Επιγειος	——— P. II. § 7.
Επιγνως τω πνευματι αυτε	Mr. ii. 8.
Επιζητεω	L. iv. 42.
Επιθυμεω	L. xvi. 21.
Επικαταρατος	Mt. xv. 4.
Επιουσιος	Mt. vi. 11.
Επισκεπτομαι	Mt. xxv. 36.
Επιστρεφω	L. xxii. 32.
Επιτιμαω	Mt. xvi. 22. [2] Mr. ix. 25.

Επιτροπος	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
Επιφωσκω	L. xxiii. 54.
Επιφωσκων	D. VI. P. II. § 7.
Επω	J. xii. 49.
Επωταν πεπαρρησια	Mt. v. 11.
Ερημος	Mr. i. 3.
Ερριφιον	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Ερριμμενοι	Mt. ix. 36. 2.
ὁ Ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριε	D. V. P. II. § 12. Mt. xi. 3.
Ερωταω	J. xvi. 30.
Εσκυλμενοι	Mt. ix. 36. 2.
Εως	L. v. 2.
Εωσφορος	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Ευαγγελιστ	D. V. P. II.
Ευαγγελιζειν	D. VI. P. V.
Ευαγγελισης	——————§ 16.
Ευλογια	L. ii. 14. 2.
Ευλαβης	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
ὁ Ευλογητος	Mr. xiv. 61.
Ευλογεω	Mt. xiv. 19.
Ευχαριστεω	Ibid.
Εως θανατου	Mt. xxvi. 38.
—— ὁ	Mt. i. 25. 2.

Z

Ζηλωτας	L. vi. 15.
Ζημιοω	Mt. xvi. 26.
Ζιζανια	Mt. xiii. 25.
Ζωγρεω	L. v. 10.
Ζων ὑδωρ	J. iv. 10. 2.

H

Ηγεμονευω	L. ii. 2. 2.
Ηγεμων	D. VIII. P. III. § 17. Mt. ii. 6. 2.
Ηλικια	L. xii. 25.
Ηρωδιανοι	Mt. xxii. 16.

Θ

Θαλασσα	Mt. iv. 15. 2.
Θαμβος	L. v. 9.
Θαπτω	J. xix. 40.
Θιλω	Mt. xvi. 24. L. xiii. 31. J. vii. 17. xvii. 24.
Θεμελιος	Mt. xxv. 34.
Θεν οικος	Mt. xii. 4.
ὁ Θεος της αιωνος και ὁ	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Θεοφιλος	L. i. 3. 3.
Θησαυρος	Mt. vi. 19.
Θριξιν	Mt. xi. 17.

I

Ιδιος	D. VI. P. I. § 22. J. v. 18.
Ιδιον	L. i. 9.
Ιλεως σοι	Mt. xvi. 22. 3.
Ιματιον	D. VIII. P. III. § 2. J. xiii. 4.
Ινα	Mt. i. 22. 2. Mr. v. 23. J. xvi. 2.
Ισος	Mr. xiv. 56.
Ισως	L. xx. 13.

K

Καθαιρω	J. xv. 2.
Καθαρισμος	L. ii. 22.
Καθαρος	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Καθαρος τη καρδια	Mt. v. 6.
Καθεξης	L. i. 3. 2.
Καθηγητης	Mt. xxiii. 8.
Και	Mt. v. 19. 2.
ἡ Καινη διαθηκη	D. V. P. III.
Καιρος συκων	Mr. xi. 13.
Καιομενον	J. v. 35. 2.
Κακολογεω	Mt. xv. 4.
Κακοποιεω	Mr. iii. 4.
Κακος	Mt. xxv. 26.
Καλεσμαι μεγας	Mt. v. 19. 4.
Καρδια	D. IV. § 23, 24.
Κατα	Mt. Title. J. ii. 6. 2.
Καταβαινω	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Καταβολη κοσμου	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. Mt. xxv. 34.
Καταγγελλω	D. VI. P. V. § 15.
Κατακλινομαι	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
Κατακρινω	Mr. xvi. 16. 3. J. viii. 11.
Κατακλυσμα	L. ii. 7. 2.
Καταλυω	Mt. v. 17.
Καταναθεματιζω	Mt. xv. 4.
Καταραομαι	Ibid.
Καταρτιζω	Mr. i. 19.
Κατασκηνωσις	Mt. viii. 20. 2.
Καταχθονιος	D. VI. P. II. § 6.
Κατεχω	L. iv. 42. 2.
Κερας	L. i. 69, 70, 71.
Κερατιον	L. xv. 16. 2.
Κεφαλαιοω	Mr. xii. 4.
Κηρυσσω και ὁ	D. VI. P. V. § 2—8.
Κητος	Mt. xii. 40.
Κλεπτης	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Κληρονομεω	Mt. v. 5.
Κλιτος	Mt. xxii. 14.
Κλιζασος	Mt. vi. 30. 2.
Κλισια	Mr. vi. 40.
Κοιλια	Mr. vii. 19.
Κοινος	——— 2.
Κολαζεσθαι	Mt. i. 19. 2.
Κολοβοω	Mt. xxiv. 22.
Κολπος τ. Αβρααμ	D. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.
Κολυμβηθρα	J. v. 2. 2.
Κοφινος	Mr. vii. 11, 12.
Κορβανας	Mt. xxvii. 6.
Κοσμεω	Mt. xii. 44.
Κοσμος	D. III. § 8.

Κυβοδια	-	Mt. xxvii. 65.
Κοφινος	-	Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Κραβαττος	-	Mt. ix. 20.
Κρατιστος	-	L. i. 3. [4.]
Κριμα	-	Mr. xii. 40. [2.]
Κρισις	-	Mt. xxiii. 23. [2.] J. v. 22.
ὁ εν τω Κρυπτω	-	Mt. vi. 18.
Κταομαι	-	L. xxi. 19.
Κτιζω	-	D. III. § 7.
Κυλλος	-	Mt. xv. 30, 31.
Κυριος	-	D. VII. P. I.

A

Ααλεω	-	D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12. L. i. 69, 70, 71. J. xii. 49.
Λαμβανω	-	Mt. viii. 17.
Λαμπρος	-	L. xxiii. 11.
Λατρια	-	J. xvi. 2. [2.]
Λατρευω	-	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
Λειτουργια	-	Ibid.
Λευκος	-	L. xxiii. 11.
Λησης	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Λιθοβολεω	-	Mt. xxi. 35.
Λινον τυφομενον		Mt. xii. 20.
Λογος	-	Mt. iv. 4. L. i. 2. J. i. 1.
Λογοι της χαριτος		L. iv. 22. [2.]
Λοιπον	-	Mt. xxvi. 45.
Λυω	-	J. ix. 7.
Λυχνος	-	Mt. v. 15.
Λυω	-	——19.

M

Μαγδαληνη	-	Mt. xxvii. 56.
Μαγοι	-	Mt. ii. 1.
Μαθητευω	-	Mt. xxviii. 19, 20.
Μακαριος	-	Mt. v. 3. xiii. 16.
Μακραν	-	Mt. viii. 30.
Μακροθυμεω	-	L. xviii. 7.
Μακροθυμια	-	L. viii. 15.
Μαμωνα της αδικιας		L. xvi. 9.
Μανθανω	-	Mt. xi. 29.
Μαρτυρ	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 14.
Μαρτυρειτινι	-	L. iv. 22.
Μαγισατης	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Μεθυω	-	J. ii. 10.
Μελλω	-	Mt. iii. 7.
Μεριζω	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Μεριμναω	-	Mt. vi. 25.
Μετα	-	L. xi. 7.
Μεταμελομαι	-	D. VI. P. III.
Μεταγειω	-	Ibid.
Μετοικεσια, μετοικια		Mt. i. 11, 12.
Μετρητης	-	J. ii. 6.
Μετρον πιστεως	-	D. IV. § 14.
Μελωτη	-	Mt. vii. 15. [2.]
Μηποτε	-	Mt. iv. 6.
Μητι	-	Mt. xii. 23. J. iv. 29.
Μισθω	-	L. xiv. 26.
Μνημα	-	D. VI. P. II. § 8.
Μνησθηναι ελεους		L. i. 54, 55.
Μοδιος	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 6. Mt. v. 15. [2.]
Μοιχαλις	-	Mt. xii. 39.
Μοιχευω	-	Mt. v. 28.
Μυλη	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
Μυλος ονικος	-	Ibid.
Μυρον	-	Mt. xxvi. 7.
Μυστηριον	-	D. IX. P. I. Mt. xiii. 11.
Μωρε	-	Pr. Mt. § 25.
Μωρολογια	-	Mt. xii. 36.
Μωρος	-	Mt. xi. 25. [3.]

N

Ναι, ναι	-	Mt. v. 37.
Ναος	-	L. i. 9.
Νεαρος πιστικη	-	Mr. xiv. 3. [2.]
Νεανισκος	-	——— 51. [2.]
Νηπιον	-	Mt. xi. 25. [3]
Νιπτω	-	Mr. vii. 3, 4. J. ix. 7.
Νοεω	-	Mt. xxiv. 15. [3.]
Νομιζομαι	-	L. iii. 23. [2.]
Νομικος	-	D. XII. P. V. § 12.
Νομοδιδασκαλος		Ibid.
Νομος	-	J. x. 34.

Ξ

Ξυλον	-	L. xxii. 52. [2.] Mt. vi. 30.

O

Ὁ, ἡ, το	-	Mt. i. 6. v. 15. [3.]
Οικοδομεω	-	D. IV. § 18.
Οικονομος της αδικιας	-	L. xvi. 8. [2.]
ὁ Οικος του Θεου	-	Mt. xii. 4.
Οικουμενη	-	L. ii. 1.
Οικτειρω	-	Mt. ix. 36.
Ολιγοπιστος	-	Mt. vi. 30. [3.]
Ολιγοψυχος	-	Mt. v. 3. [3.]
Ὁμοιοπαθης	-	D. IV. § 25.
Ὁμοιωμα	-	J. v. 37, 38.
Ὁμοφρονες	-	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
Ονειδιζω	-	Mt. v. 11.
Ονομα	-	J. xvii. 11.
Ονος αλετης	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
Οπισω μου	-	Mt. xvi. 24. [2.]
Ὁπως	-	Mt. xii. 14.
Ὁρκιζω	-	Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7.
Ορφανος	-	J. xiv. 18.
Ὁσιος και ὁ	-	D. VI. P. IV.
Οτι	-	L. i. 41.
Ου, ουκ	-	Mt. v. 37.

Ου πας - D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X. P. II. § 8, 9.
Ουαι - L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
Ουδεν ισιν - Mt. xxiii. 16. 18.
Ουκετι - Mr. xv. 5.
Ουρανοι - D. V. P. I. § 4.
Ουτος - D. III. § 23. Mt. xii. 24.
Οφειλημα - Mt. vi. 12.
ὁ Οφις ὁ παλαιος - D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Οψια - Mt. xiv. 23.
Οψις - J. vii. 24.

Π

Παγις - Mt. v. 29.
Παθος - D. IV. § 25.
Παιδιον - D. XII. P. I. § 11. 19. J. xiii. 33.
Παις - Mt. ii. 16. 2.
ἡ Παλαια διαθηκη - D. V. P. III.
Παλαιοτης - L. xii. 25.
Παλιγγενεσια - D. XII. P. I. § 22. Mt. xix. 28.
Πανδοχειον - L. ii. 7. 2.
Παπας - D. IV. § 18.
Παντοτροφος - J. iv. 10.
Παρα - J. xvii. 5.
οἱ Παρ' αυτω - Mr. iii. 21. 2.
Παραδιαζομαι - L. xxiv. 29.
Παραβολη - Mt. xiii. 3.
Παραδειγματιζω - Mt. i. 19. 2.
Παραδεισος - D. VI. P. II. § 21.
Παραδοξα - L. v. 26.
Παραδοσις - Pr. Mt. § 8.
Παραδυς - D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
Παρακλητος, και ἑ - J. xiv. 6.
Παρακολουθεω - L. i. 3.
Παρασκευη - J. xix. 14.
Παρατηρεω - J. xv. 20.
Παροιμια - J. xvi. 25.
Πασχα - D. VIII. P. II. § 3, 4. J. xix. 14.
Πασχειν - D. IV. § 25.
Πεζη - Mt. xiv. 3.
Πειναω - Mr. v. 6.
Πειραζω - Mt. xvi. 1.
ὁ Πειραζων - D. VI. P. I. § 4.
Πεμπω - J. x. 36. Mt. vi. 13.
Πεπραγμενον αυτω - L. xxiii. 15.
Πεσαν - Mt. iv. 15.
Περισσος - D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Περισσευω - Mt. v. 20.
Περισσοι - ——— 47. 2.
Περιτομη - D. VIII. P. II. § 2.
Περιχωρος - Mr. i. 28.
Πετρα, Πετρος - J. i. 43.
τα Πετραδη - Mt. xiii. 5.
Πηρα εις ὁδον - Mt. x. 10.
Πηχυς - L. xii. 25.

Πιστευω - D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. ii. 22. 2.
της Πιστεως αναλογια - D. IV. § 14.
Πιστις - L. xviii. 8.
Πιστος - J. xx. 27.
Πλειον - Mt. xii. 41, 42.
Πλεονεξια - Mr. vii. 22.
Πληροφορεω - L. i. 1.
Πληροω - Mt. i. 22. v. 17. 2.
Πλησιον - D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Πλοιον - L. v. 2.
Πνευμα - D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11. D. VI. P. II. § 23.
——— ακαθαρτον, πονηρον - D. VI. P. I. § 11.
Πνευματα - D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
εκ Πνευματος γεγεννημενος - J. iii. 8.
Ποιεω - D. III. § 7.
Ποιμαινω - J. xxi. 16.
Πολλοι - J. xii. 42.
Πολυελεος - D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Ποτηρις - Mt. v. 37. 2. xxv. 26.
ὁ Ποτηρος - D. VI. P. I. § 4. 8.
Πρασια - Mr. vi. 40.
Πρασσω - L. iii. 13.
Πραυθυμος - Mt. v. 3. 3.
Πρεσβυτεριον - L. xxii. 66.
Προβατικη - J. v. 2. 2.
Προγινωσκω - D. IV. § 21.
Προδυς - D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
Πρεσβυτερεω - D. IV. § 21.
Προσραομαι - ——— § 20.
Προς - L. xix. 9.
Προς το - Mt. v. 28. 2.
Προσευχη - L. vi. 12.
Προσκυνεω - Mt. ii. 2. 2.
Προσλαζομενος - Mt. xvi. 22.
Προφασις - Mt. xxiii. 14.
Προφητης - Mt. vii. 15. Mr. vi. 15.
Προφητευω - Mt. xxvi. 68.
Πρωτοκλισια - D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
Πρωτος - L. xiv. 1. J. xv. 18.
Πρωτοτοκος - Mt. i. 25.
Πτερυγιον τη ἱματιε - Mt. ix. 20.
Πτυον - Mt. iii. 12.
Πτωχοι τω πνευματι - Mt. v. 3. 3.
Πυγμη - Mr. vii. 3, 4.
Πυλαι ἁδε - D. VI. P. II. § 17.
Πωρωσις - D. IV. § 23. N.

Ρ

Ραββι - D. VII. P. II.
Ραβδος - L. xxii. 52. 2.
Ρακα - Pr. Mt. § 25.
Ρακος αγναφον - Mt. ix. 16.

Ρημα	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X. P. II. § 9. Mt. iv. 4.
—— αργον	Mt. xii. 36.
Ριπτω	Mt. ix. 36. [2]
Ρυομαι	Mt. vi. 13. [2]

Σ

Σαββας	Mt. xii. 5.
Σαγηνη	Mt. iv. 18.
Σαπρος	Mt. vii. 17.
Σαρξ	D. I. P. I. § 11. N. 14. N.
Σατανας	D. VI. P. I. § 3. 8, 9.
Σειηνιαζομαι	Mt. xvii. 15.
Σημειον	Mt. xxiv. 30.
Σικερα	L. i. 15.
Σκανδαλιζω	Mt. v. 29. xiii. 21.
Σκηνη	Mt. xvii. 4. L. xvi. 9. [3]
Σκηνοπηγια	D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
Σκηνοω	J. i. 14. [2]
Σκια θανατυ	Mt. iv. 16.
Σκληροκαρδια	D. IV. § 22.
Σκληρυνω	Ibid.
Σκολοψ	Mt. vii. 3.
Σοφια λογυ	D. I. P. I. § 10.
Σοφος	Mt. xi. 25. [3]
Σπεκυλατωρ	Mr. vi. 27.
Σπλαγχνιζομαι	Mt. ix. 36.
Σπορος	Mt. xiii. 19.
Σπυρις	Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Σταυροω	Mr. xv. 25.
Στομαχος	Mr. vii. 19.
Στρατηγοι τυ ἱερυ	L. xxii. 52.
Στρεφω	Mt. xviii. 3.
Στρωννυμι	Mr. xiv. 15.
Συ λεγεις	Mt. xxvii. 11.
Συγχραομαι	J. iv. 19.
Συκοφαντεω	D. XII. P. I. § 16.
Συμβαλλω	L. ii. 19.
Συμπληροσθαι	L. ix. 51.
Συμποσιον	Mr. vi. 40.
Συνεδριον	D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
Συνετος	Mt. xi. 25. [3]
Συνθηκη	D. V. P. III. § 1.
Συνιημι	Mt. xiii. 19.
Συνοδια	L. ii. 44.
Συντελεια	Mt. xiii. 39.
Συντηρεω	Mr. vi. 20.
Συντριβω	Mr. xiv. 3. [2]
Σφραγιζω	J. iii. 33.
Σχισμα	D. IX. P. III.
Σωτηριον	L. ii. 30, 31.

T

Ταλαντον	D. VIII. P. I. § 8. 10.
Ταπεινος	Mt. v. 3. [3] D. II. P. II. § 2.
—— τη καρδια	Mt. xi. 29. [2]
Ταπεινοφρων και ἡ	Mt. v. 3. [3] D. II. P. II. § 2.
Ταρταρος	D. VI. P. II. § 19.
Ταφος	—— § 8.
Τεκνιον	J. xiii. 33.
Τεκνον	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Τεκτων	Mt. xiii. 55.
Τελειν πολεις	Mt. x. 23. [3]
Τελωνιον	Mt. ix. 9.
Τεταρταιος	J. xi. 39.
Τετραρχης	Mt. xiv. 1.
Τηρεω	J. xv. 20.
Τι	Mr. viii. 37.
Τιμαω	D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. xii. 26.
Τοκος	Mt. xxv. 27.
Τολμαω	Mr. xii. 34. J. xxi. 12. [2]
Τοπος ἁγιος	Mt. xxiv. 15.
Τριςατης	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Τροφη	Mt. x. 10. [4]
Τροχος	L. xii. 25.
Τυφομενον λινον	Mt. xii. 20.

Υ

Ὑδωρ ζων	J. iv. 10. [2]
ὁ Υιος τυ ανθρωπυ	D. V. P. IV. § 13.
—— της απωλειας, και ἡ	D. VI. P. II. § 1.
—— Δαβιδ	D. V. P. IV. § 14.
—— Θευ και ἡ	Mt. xiv. 33.
—— Διαβολυ	D. VI. P. I. § 3. P. II. § 1.
Υιοι τυ νυμφωνος	Mr. ii. 19.
Ὑμνεω	Mt. xxvi. 30.
Ὑπηρετης	——— 58. [2] L. i. 2. ii. 14. iv. 20.
Ὑποδηματα	Mt. x. 10. [3]
Ὑποκριτης	Mt. xxiv. 51. [2] D. III. § 24.
Ὑπομονη	L. viii. 15.
Ὑσσωπος	J. xix. 29.
Ὑψιστος	L. ii. 14.
Ὑψοω	J. iii. 14.

Φ

Φαγειν αρτον	L. xiv. 15.
Φατνη	L. ii. 7.
Φιλαθεος	L. i. 3. [3]
Φιλοπρωτευων	D. VII. P. II. § 11.
Φιλος	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Φρονειν	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
Φυλακτηριον	Mt. xxiii. 5.
Φωλεος	Mt. viii. 20.

X

Χαιρω	Mt. xxviii. 9. [3]
Χαρα ἡ εμη	J. xvii. 13.

Χαρᾷ	-	L. xix. 43.
Χαρις	-	L. ii. 40. J. i. 17.
Χαριτοω	-	L. i. 28.
Χειροτονεω	-	D. X. P. V. § 7.
Χιλιαρχος	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Χιτων	-	——— § 2.
Χολη	-	Mt. xxvii. 34.
Χορτος	-	Mt. vi. 30.
Χρεια	-	L. viii. 15.
Χρηματιζω	-	Mt. ii. 12.
Χριστος	-	D. V. P. IV.
Χωρεω	-	Mt. xix. 12.
Χωριον	-	J. iv. 5.

Ψ

Ψευδοπροφητης		Mt. vii. 15.
Ψευστης	-	D. III. § 24.
Ψυχη	-	Mt. x. 39. xvi. 26. L. xiv. 26.

Ω

Ὡρα	-	Mt. viii. 13.